# PANDIT DEENDAYAL UPADHYAYA IDEOLOGY AND PERCEPTION

PART - VI POLIT

R
54.0
05-

KE

सुरुचि प्रकाशन
सु प्र

# Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya

## IDEOLOGY AND PERCEPTION

04092
P

# POLITICS FOR NATION'S SAKE

PANDIT DEENDAYAL UPADHYAYA IDEOLOGY AND PERCEPTION PART - VI

954.04092 R
~~THE-P~~
JOG-P

165785

# PANDIT DEENDAYAL UPADHYAYA

## IDEOLOGY AND PERCEPTION

## PART VI

## POLITICS FOR NATION'S SAKE

B. N. Jog

पुस्तकालय
165785
गुरुकुल कांगड़ी विश्वविद्यालय

**Suruchi Prakashan**
Keshav Kunj, Jhandewala
New Delhi - 110 055

954.04092,JOG-P
165785

R
954 04092
JOG-P

**Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya - Ideology And Perception**

**PART - VI :** POLITICS FOR NATION'S SAKE

**Author**
**B. N. Jog**

Translated By
Prof. M.K. Paranjape

Publisher
**Suruchi Prakashan**
Keshav Kunj, Jhandewala
New Delhi - 110 055
Tel : 011- 23514672, 23634561
E-mail : suruchiprakashan@gmail.com
Website : www.suruchiprakashan.com

© Suruchi Prakashan

First Edition : 1991
Second Edition : April, 2014

**Price : ₹ 80**

Printer : Artxel, Noida

ISBN : 978-93-81500-81-1

# Author's Note

Shri Rajabhau Nene is the originator and general editor of the project 'Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: Vichar Darshan'. I have been honoured by Shri Nene by entrusting me with the writing of a part of this project - a book viz. 'Politics for the Nation's Sake'. The task was onerous but very interesting. It was at once an invitation and a challenge to bring out the importance of apparently simple looking things. I undertook the difficult task with a full awareness of my shortcomings.

Panditji was moulded by RSS Lokmanya Tilak had no liking for politics and yet he took to politics as the country's need of the hour. It was the same with Panditji. All aspects of Panditji's life reflect the life-values of RSS. What he had to face, was not just the winning of an election but the heavy task of social reconstruction. On his shoulders fell the responsibility of restructuring the society shattered by a thousand years of foreign (Muslim and British) rule. Of this task politics was only a fraction. All this background must be taken into account while reviewing and analysing his politics and while searching for his motives therein.

Panditji's entry into politics and my entry into journalism were almost simultaneous. I was curious about the new political party Jana Sangh. I had also great fellow feeling for Panditji as both of us were basically RSS men. During his 17 years in Jana Sangh there were many occasions when we came together for discussions on various issues and of listening to his close arguments. In a way, it was a political education for me. All this has been very useful to me in writing the present book.

In a relatively short time, Panditji established in Indian politics a new ideal. As against the regional nationalism of Congress, international communism of Communists and democratic socialism of Socialists, Panditji imbibed in the public mind cultural nationalism, economic decentralisation and grass-root based democracy. While his imaginative thinking knew no bounds, he was astoundingly a practical organiser. He was fully aware of the fact that while action without thought is blind, thought without action is lame. This is why he was equally at home from Integral Humanism to the mass demonstration against Kachchha (Kutch) Pact with Pakistan. He was a thinker par excellence; he also possessed the inimitable skill to imbibe his thoughts into the minds of his followers. He was a philosopher and teacher rolled into one. He was a great *guru*.

In describing the greatness of a *guru*, Shri Ramdas Swami says, "The simily of a philosopher's stone is inadequate to describe *guru*. The reason is that while a philosopher's stone can touch a piece of iron and change it into gold, it cannot make a stone into another philosopher's stone. But a *guru* can transform his disciple into a *guru*. This is the secret of Panditji who could, in a short time, build up an organisation countrywide and true to his thinking and practice. He created thousands of selfless workers who could think accurately, work with deep faith and who bore ill-will to none.

While writing the book I have not merely chronicled the events of his life but also, for comparison, reviewed what other thinkers (both his contemporaries and also those in his century) have thought about various problems and how far they have succeeded in practice. My writings are, therefore, something like 'Deendayalji and his Times'.

The writing of the book has given me an opportunity to partly repay this great philosopher and patriotic politician. I am happy to put into words what the readers probably already know.

**-B.N. Jog**

# CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page No. |
|---|---|
| 1. British Rule-Boon or Curse? | 01 |
| 2. Politics for Power or for Nation? | 16 |
| 3. The Language of Swarajya must be Swabhasha | 33 |
| 4. Defence Preparedness has No Alternative | 43 |
| 5. Swadeshi Economics for People's Good | 52 |
| 6. Muslims-A Complex Problem | 65 |
| 7. Pakistan-A Challenge | 85 |
| 8. An Alternative to Congress | 102 |
| 9. Why Jana Sangh? | 117 |
| 10. The Game Ended Half Way | 133 |

## 1

# British Rule - Boon or Curse?

**W**hence does it all begin? It is generally supposed that modern *Bharat* begins from the beginning of British Rule. This epoch is doubly important. Britain conquered different provinces from different rulers. They won the battle of Plassy in 1757 and wrested Bengal from Muslims. In 1818 Union Jack went up Shaniwar Wada and consequently Maharashtra and several states controlled by Marathas were taken over from Hindus. The result was that an 800 year domination of the Muslims came to an end. The whole land was subjugated by the British and everybody was free to seek justice from law courts. Along with this the knowledge and science of the West were opened up to all the Bharatiyas. The British brought with them navigation, newspapers, finished goods, technology, weapons and also state Craft run by peoples' representatives. For a thousand years crossing the seas was a taboo for Hindus. The young now aspired to cross the seas and find out how far and in what way the West had progressed. No doubt the British enslaved us but they also brought to our door new knowledge, science and technology. Such are the reasons why the beginning of the British rule is taken to mark the beginning of modern *Bharat*.

Pandit Deendayalji was born a hundred years after the British stabilised here. In his childhood the struggle against the British rule was undergoing ever new changes. In his student days, various treacherous and pro-British Muslim activities were taking shape. When he was in his twenties, our whole country was churned up by the Second World War and by internal movements. As he entered his thirties, there arrived independence and also the division of the Motherland. Thus when Panditji entered politics, a period in modern history of *Bharat* was over and a post-independence period had commenced. But this later period bore the inevitable stamp of the events and thoughts of the preceding 150 years. This makes it necessary to study different trends of the history of modern *Bharat*. The fruit, which any tree bears, is the result of a seed sown a long time earlier. While the seed and the tree superficially appear different but are basically identical, similarly the modern history of a people or a country is an integral part of its history for thousands of years. While it is unnecessary to review the long history, yet it is necessary to remember the general background. Hence for consistency it would be proper to remember this background and also to briefly review modern history before setting forth the events and activities in Panditji's life.

## Welcome to British Rule

When British Raj arrived here, the country was in a mess. There was no strong central power. The system of justice, taxation and administration varied from province to province. There was no single central power which could control the whole populace or country. There was anarchy in political, social, educational and economic and other fields of human activity. Groups of rough and selfish men known variously as *Pindaris*, *Punds*, *Palegars* and *Thugs* cheated, looted and killed people everywhere. Swords of the armed fighters had no social purpose any more. In such circumstances, what little social order had survived was due to the village system of 12 Balutedars. (Balutedars were communities that did service to the villages in return for fixed annuities in the form of grain etc.). People were sustained, to some extent, by the moral bindings that accompany *dharma*. Political power had not pervaded all walks of life and so life was, broadly speaking, unaffected by who-so-ever ruled - be he a bandit, a gang leader, a '*Khan*', a '*Nawab*' or a '*Jagirdar*'. Fields were tilled depending on the seasons, the grain was reaching markets, buying and selling continued as usual, cloth was woven and tailors made garments, metal potters, iron-smiths, carpenters, masons, shoe-makers, bangle-makers, brewers and commercial middlemen went about their jobs routinely.

There were money-lenders and bodies which worked on an all *Bharat* basis in transfers of money from one part of the country to another; the working of these was systematic. There were many marketing centres where were sold the very thin clothes of Dhaka, silk goods from Varanasi, sarees from Coimbatore, shoes from Pune, artifacts from Cuttack, idols from Jaipur, betel-nuts from Shreevardhan and many more things. There were weekly *bazars*. The annual *bazars* for cattle, various annual festivals in honour of goddess Ambadevi to Mari-Aai and traditional visits to holy places from Rameshwaram to Kashi. Nothing much depended on who ruled the country. The main reason for this was that as yet there was not present any knowledge of any science or technology which would affect any change in trade, income or education. Even when steam power and new production techniques brought about a vast change in Europe, things were still unchanged; the steam-power and machine age had not yet arrived here. While in England politics was evolving from Magna Carta to Cromwell, it was the strength of arms that decided who the ruler here would be; even the thought that people should be their own rulers had not sprouted here.

This, however, does not mean that there was no orderly social life here; but the centre of the system was not society but an individual or a family or a community. There was *dharma* but it was for the attainment of an individual merit by rituals and for salvation after death. Armed Muslim aggression against *Hindu Dharma* and culture went on for a thousand years and yet Hindus, as a people, did not oppose or counter it. Muslim rulers were doing havoc to our religion and culture but Hindus en masse never cared to fearlessly fight back and defeat them, if necessary at the cost of their lives - this had been the tragedy of the *Hindu* society. While the Muslim power was collapsing partly due to the inherent shortcomings of Islam and partly due to the somewhat organised efforts of Marathas, Rajputs and Sikhs; the English had begun securing a strong foot-hold here on the strength of science, better organisation and discipline. It is significant that the battle of Plassy was fought four years before the battle of Panipat. The English came here avowedly not as iconoclasts or as ruthless aggressors like Mahmood of Gazni, Mohamed Ghori, or Alla-uddin Khilji, but they came seemingly rather to bestow on the people here the benefits of new knowledge and progressive thoughts. The English came here as traders but were not looked upon as marauders. In this connection may be quoted a dialogue from the drama-'*Savai Madhavrawancha Mrityu*' (Death of Savai Madhavrao). The English approach the Maratha Court to seek permission to sell their mercantile in Pune market. Nana Phadnis does not grant the permission. But Madhavrao fails to see anything wrong in giving the permission. He asks Nana, "What is wrong if Pune markets are beautified by addition of English varieties?" This is an imaginary conversation in a literary drama. But it is significant that the drama was penned by gifted dramatist like Khadilkar in Pune itself and that too only 75 years after Peshwas were finally defeated. This just shows that the coming of the British was vastly different from the ruthless aggression of the Muslims.

The aggressed and oppressed people here welcomed the British rule. Earlier, life was very unsafe and with the advent of the British, a general feeling of security was so advanced that people could venture on a long journey without fear of being robbed. How did the educated elite feel about the British? Rammohan Roy was born in Bengal in 1774. He was forty four years of age by the time the Peshwas were defeated and the British ruled the whole country. He was extremely happy that the Hindus were freed from the barbarous and uncultured rule of the Muslims and that there was far greater security now; he came to look upon the British rule as a boon of God. In one place

Raja Rammohan Roy says, "I am happy and thankful to God, who controls the universe, for freeing the people from Muslim slavery and bringing them under British rule." Of course this did not mean that the new rulers were good in every way, but it was certainly much better than the repression of the Muslim Sultans. The comparison was between the Muslim rulers and their officers who levied Jazia tax on Hindus, who would abduct *Hindu* brides and who would force beef into the mouths of Hindus and forcibly convert them to Islam, on one hand and the British who stopped *Sati* practice by law, who fixed land revenue to fixed rates, who established law courts where people could seek justice against even small injustices done to them. This explains why against the earlier Muslims' back-ground, the British appeared almost as angels to the people.

## Disillusionment About the British

But slowly this novelty wore off and the British injustice to the country began to be realised. The thinkers here began to feel that the British rule was doing much injustice to the country both in the political and economic fields. This realisation began with Dadabhai Naoroji and Justice Ranade. Lokmanya Tilak openly opposed the British and Swatantrya-veer Savarkar took to arms against them. Forty years earlier to the days of the revolutionaries, there had been the conflagration of the 1857 war of independence. The military rising could not overturn the British cart but fortunately the ire against it was also not quenched. The result was that on the one hand with a pacifying intension the British enacted laws for greater and greater participation of the people in the government and on the other hand the leaders of the people prompted movements for securing ever-greater power to the people through constitutional reforms.

Even the people who considered British Raj as a boon, were not happy with slavery to the British. Even today we come across men from among the old generation who feel that, considering the post-independence corruption, nepotism, muscle power, goondaism, long delays in justice and overall insecurity, perhaps the British Raj was better. This, of course, does not mean that they prefer foreign domination to *Swarajya*. It only means they very much appreciated the law and order situation and the security of life under the British. With all this, people slowly began to feel that, all said and done, they were slaves of the British. To this were added the repercussions of the mass brutalities and the total destruction of whole villages on mere suspicion during the 1857 war. People realised how ruthlessly cruel the British can be when their power is at stake and the feeling that the British were angels withered away. What then remained was a new outlook, democracy and new science. A whole new generation sprang up having this new outlook coupled with self-respect and national honour. Lokmanya Tilak came forward at the early age of 25 to mould and lead this young generation. Though Lokmanya Tilak was the first to lead this war against the British rule, credit goes to Dadabhai Naoroji and Justice Ranade of the earlier generation for preparing the intellectual background. During the student days of Tilak, Justice Ranade had been lecturing to young men in Pune on how the British were economically exploiting India. Dadabhai Naoroji had also been propounding the evil effects of British Raj in *Bharat* and had been pressing the government for political rights to the Indians. But towards the close of his life he was convinced that the British cared a tuppence for the people's supplications and prayers and openly declared his convictions. In 1906, at the age of 81, he declared from his position as Congress President, "If I were young, I would have insurrected." It is interesting to note that 30 years earlier Vasudeo Balwant Phadke had declared war on the British. Lokmanya Tilak had chosen a path mid-way between these two. Tilak was pressing the government for more and more powers to the people. But at the same time, instead of taking to arms he was moulding the young into patriots keen on independence. In 1896 there was a severe famine and all the neighbouring villages were abandoned; thousands were dying from starvation. The analysis by Tilak of the abject poverty is very interesting. He wrote, "It is necessary to enquire into why in India, crores of people should be starved. The cause of the abject poverty is to be found in the method of governance. The governance is such that the people here are being cruelly exploited and wealth is flowing away to England.

"As when blood sucking insects are let loose in the human body, all that remains is the bony, skeleton, so now all Indian wealth is being sucked off to England and the skeletons of Indian slaves are all that is left over here. In a village a few Marvadis become millionaires at the cost of the public; similarly here there are everywhere European factories and traders. All this has resulted in England's affluence, while we have lost all our industries and trade." Tilak did not stop at this analysis. While agitating to rouse peoples' dissatisfaction with the British, he prompted the educated young people to go to the villages to educate the masses and also to make them conscious to their rights. The government had prepared a famine code, which contained several things like waving the land revenue, non-enforcement of court orders for confiscation, to give the farmers employment on famine relief works. But the farmers were ignorant of these relief provisions and the unscrupulous officials were exploiting the farmers. Tilak was trying to rouse the people while yet remaining within the framework of law. His intellect, his talk and his pen were all devoted to this one aim. In connection with this famine he wrote, "Empress Victoria and her government here have expressly desired that nobody shall die of starvation. But it behoves our leaders here today to communicate this wish to the people and to do all they can to save their lives..... There are many government provisions which have not yet been put into practice. We must raise our voice against these and see that they are actually practiced." Tilak prompted the educated young men to go to villages and bring government-proffered aid to them. He also remarked, "If you cannot do even this for our people, it is in vain that you have been educated. "During the famine Tilak was touring Maharashtra and collecting around him a band of young patriots. His appeal to the common man was, "Flogging people who are hunger-mad or speaking arrogantly to the people saying 'Accept work as road metal breakers or face starvation death' or 'Sell your cattle and pay the land revenue' is totally wrong and misguiding. If death is inevitable, what does it matter if people die from government bullets while demanding facilities proffered by government?"

Tilak, convinced of the evil of British Raj, moved heaven and earth in educating and rousing the public.

Tilak knew very well the benefits of British rule. In the earlier Muslim rule there was neither knowledge nor science. The Muslim rulers only rejoiced in conversion of Hindus to *Islam*. It was, they thought, their right to rape any *Hindu* lady they chose. Compared to such slavery, the slavery to the British was no doubt milder. But the world knowledge, to which the British opened doors, inspired the leaders here to resolve to do away with British domination. America threw off the British yoke. There was also a revolution in France. Japan defeated White Russia. All this knowledge inspired the people to end the British rule.

## National Resurgence Begins

But how was this to be brought about? Only when a slave thinks he is superior to his master, does the former ever become eager to break the bond of servitude. There was nothing in English education that would kindle this national pride. What is the remedy? As a remedy, Tilak decided to start celebrating the birth anniversary of Shivaji Maharaj. About it Tilak wrote, "National festivals are among the means for the perpetuation of patriotism. Shivaji's birth festival is an expression of the historic principle that no nation can hope to rise if it forgets its past great men. Shivaji festival is an expression of this principle. The development of national language, the study of and pondering over our national history, faith in our religion must form the basis of our national upliftment; festivals like Shivaji Jayanti also water the same roots of national resurgence." These thoughts of Tilak dispelled the past 50 years of the mentality which worshipped and imitated all that was foreign.

He successfully countered the then tendency of the Indians to regard everything Indian worthless and all things British as the models worth copying. Tilak taught the people to hold their own against the British cultural and social thinking and practice. This served as a strong base on which, during the next twenty-five years, many young men came forward to take a great leap forward in political, social and economic original thinking consistent with Indian ethos. There rose a galaxy of stars from Aravind Babu to Savarkar, Swami Dayanand Saraswati to Vivekanand, poet Govind to Subrahmanya Bharati, Shiva-rampant Paranjape to the great historian Raj wade, Sister Nivedita to Dr. Mrs. Annie Besant and many more in different fields of life. This period may be styled the resurgence period in Indian History.

To get back our independence, to learn and absorb modern science to examine our ancient religious customs in the light of modern scientific thought, to gratefully remember our past great men who helped our nation to tide over calamities and to draw inspiration from them; These and other similar thoughts had filled the atmosphere. This awakening is reflected in dramas like 'Sharada' to 'Keechak Vadha' and novels like 'Pan Lakshat Kon Gheto' to 'Ushakal'.

The whole country was witnessing such political and social renaissance. At that time Calcutta was India's metro-polis. In Bengal, Brahmo Samaj was formed under the leadership of Raja Rammohan Roy and this Samaj devoted itself to social and religious reforms. Later on this Samaj was led by the poet Ravindranath Thakur and he undertook to educate people, drawing his inspiration from our ancient culture. The newspapers 'Kesari' and '*Hindu*' were started at Pune and Madras respectively. Great leaders like Surendranath Banerji (Bengal) and Rangayya Naidu and Subbarao Pantalu came forward to educate the people. A common characteristic of all these leaders of the reawakening was that they were all Hindus. They were all very proud of their country, their people, their languages and their religion. During the British rule Muslims, Christians and Parsis were enslaved just like the Hindus. It is necessary to examine what the Muslim leaders were doing for independence after the 1857 war.

We shall take up this question later on. Let us first consider the events during the 35 years of Tilak's time that is roughly since the inception of the Congress.

**People Reduced to Abject Poverty**

The initial euphoria that the British rule is god-given boon was lost soon. But there was a large group of men who thought it possible that Hindusthan can be free by constitutional means. For Lokmanya Tilak the constitutional method consisted in preparing people to resist unjust laws. Slowly there was emerging a class of people who thought it necessary to oust the British from India, if necessary by use of arms. This period extends from the time of Vasudeo Balwant Phadke to that of Subhash Chandra Bose. The philosophy of the revolutionaries was set forth by Savarkar at the early age of sixteen; he threw an open challenge to the British power in its very capital. Lala Hardayal in Punjab, Aravind Ghosh in Bengal, Savarkar in Maharashtra and Vanchi Aiyer in Madras were pioneer revolutionaries. How was it that the British rule, which appeared a boon just fifty years ago earlier, came to be most hated so soon? Justice Ranade had perceived very early the evil economic effects of the rule and had already started educating the young people accordingly. Slowly it dawned upon the people that at the basis of all our ills is this foreign rule. In 1899 Lord Curzon became the Viceroy of India. His arrogance brought home to the people the feeling that the constitutional way was thoroughly useless. In spite of all efforts by Tilak to put guts and fight into Congress, the Congress remained quite mild and ineffective though it would easily see the totally destructive nature of the British rule. Heart-rending was the description of Indians' poverty made by Congress President Shri Surendranath Banerji at Ahmedabad in 1901. In his presidential speech he said, "...Though the above figures give some idea of famine condition, the actual condition is far worse as seen from figures of hunger-deaths during the famine. To get a clear idea, let us consider four parts of the present (19th) century. Each part stretches over twenty-five years. In the first 25 years there were five famines and starvation deaths were 10 lakhs. In the second quarter of a century, famine number was two and hunger-deaths were five lakhs. In the third quarter, there were six famines and hunger deaths were 50 lakhs. Now consider the last quarter. The number of famine years was 18 and famine deaths numbered two crores and sixty lakhs.

"It will thus be seen that during the 19th century famine had become permanent. The absence of rain is not the only cause of famines. There are no-rain years in other countries also; but there it does not lead to famine. Poverty is the main cause of famine deaths here. If the people were not so poor, then in the absence of rain in any particular province, people could either have purchased food from neighbouring provinces or could have filled up their own grainaries in years of normal rainfall to help them tide over in no-rain years. But the people are at the rock bottom of poverty and cannot follow such prudent methods. Most people do not get even one full meal a day; and when famine strikes, they die in lakhs."

## Politics Becomes Aggressive

The above words of Surendranath Bannerji throw a flood light on the horrible effects of British Rule. And it would have been surprising if the circumstances did not produce revolutionaries who had a burning desire to end the British rule at any cost. The British adopted very severe repressive methods against the revolutionaries. The government did everything from flogging to hanging, from hand-cuffs to oil extraction work, transportations from Andaman to Mandalay and showering insults and threats. They also tried to ease out the aggressive politics and the revolutionary movement by bestowing on the people some political reforms in 1909 and 1919. The two are known respectively as Morle Minto and Montague-Chelmsford political reforms. The work of the revolutionaries was important in two ways. One effect was the feeling aroused among the people that the British Yoke must be cast away at all costs; the second effect was that the British began to feel that after all their rule cannot continue much longer here. This is why the British thought it wiser to give the people at least some share in power. But while doing this they also adopted the policy of divide and rule and the Muslims became an easily available tool in their hands. The Muslims had never identified themselves with this country and the people here. Since Mohammad Bin Kasim's first invasion of Sindh in 712 A.D., the Muslims behaved here as aggressors and Hindus could see that they were foreign aggressors, iconoclasts and marauders. Secondly, since the British rule began here, the Muslims never opposed the English - the solitary exception being that of Bahadurshah in the 1857 war of independence. It is true that Badruddin Tayyabji accepted Presidentship of Congress but in less than one year he suggested that Congress should be closed down for 5 years; Sayyed Ahmed went further and openly sided with Muslims and opposed Hindus and even declared that a nation in which Muslims and Hindus are united was an impossibility. The British as natural foreign rulers, adopted the policy of 'divide and rule'. All political leaders from Justice Ranade and Ferozshah Mehta to the later Mahatma Gandhi and Nehru and all the political parties committed the same blunder of supposing that the Muslims were inherently one with Hindus but it was the British who drove a wedge between them. This mistaken notion has done a tremendous harm to the Indian polity.

It was in 1906 that the British openly sided with the Muslims. Under the leadership of Aga Khan, a representation of Muslims met the then Viceroy, Lord Minto, to voice their demands. They demanded that in view of the earlier affluence of the Muslims and the great support and help which Muslims lent to the British Empire, Muslims should be given separate representation. Lord Minto said, "I do thoroughly agree with you. Your demand is not merely as that of a community. Taking into account your political importance, it is not adequate to give you representation proportional to your members but it must be more. The service you have rendered to the British Empire must be taken into account." The Muslim League was formed in less than a month after this. About the above words of Lord Minto, Lady Minto has noted in her diary, "Lord Minto's words eliminated 6 crores of people (i.e. the Muslims) from those that opposed the British." This gave a sanction to what Sir Sayyed Ahmed was trying to do. Thus the word 'divide' in the British policy of 'divide and rule' meant a prevention of coming together of Muslims with Hindus.

The aggressive politicians and the revolutionaries were not all satisfied with the crumbs of power thrown to the people; they continued their efforts unabated. The aggressive politicians were incarcerated at Mandalay, while the revolutionaries were either hanged or had to toil and rot in the Andamans. The repression of the first two decades of the 20th century deeply imbibed in the public mind the inevitability of eliminating the British from this country. This feeling of the masses was the foundation of the public support to Gandhiji's movement.

Lokmanya Tilak died in 1920. In the Nagpur Congress, which soon followed, a programme of non-co-operation was chalked out. From then till independence, Mahatma Gandhi was the leader all along. As such it is important to study his personality and views.

Gandhiji started his political work in Africa and he roused the people to civil disobedience against the white rulers. Ruskin and Tolstoy were Gandhi's models at that time. In 1915, Gandhi came to India and he became the disciple of Gokhale, the leader of the moderates. Gokhale and Gandhi differed in age by just four years but Gokhale had inherited from Justice Ranade the leadership of the moderates and Gandhi became heir to Gokhale who died at the age of 50 within a year of their meeting. As advised by Gokhale, Gandhi spent a year in closely studying the situation in India. Tilak had returned from Mandalay just a few months prior to Gandhi's coming to India. But the ways of Tilak and Gandhi were quite different - Gandhi laid emphasis on the means, while for Tilak the attainment of the goal was the more important thing. Gandhi's thoughts were as aggressive as those of Tilak, but while the latter would denounce Lord Curzon as an Aurangazeb, Gandhi would refrain from using such a term. Gandhi did not hate his enemies and nonviolence was his creed. In 1917 Gandhiji led a 'Satyagraha' in Champaran - about a blue raw pigment called 'Neel' (Indigo). When a case was put up against him in a law court, he freely pleaded guilty as under the existing rules. But government released him. The speech he made earlier in 1916 at the inauguration of Banaras *Hindu* University throws a better light on his thoughts. Gandhiji said, "Congress has adopted a resolution on '*Swarajya*'. I am sure that very soon All India Congress Committee and Muslim League will place a programme before the people. But so far as I am concerned, I feel more interested in what the students and the masses will do." Gandhiji categorically declared that the masses were the basis of his movements. Tilak's movements had the same foundation but he always tried to persuade the moderates in the Congress and only when that became an impossibility did he permit Congress to be split in 1907. But as soon as he was free from jail at Mandalay in 1914, he tried once again to bridge the gap by trying to woo over the moderates. This difference in the mental make-up of Gandhi and Tilak is very important. In the speech at Banaras, referred to above, Gandhiji had very forcefully and clearly expressed himself in an attempt to educate the people. He had said, "The Viceroy has inaugurated the University in this vast and decorated pandal whose sight would please a jeweler from Paris. I compared the royalty and the noblemen, richly dressed and ornamented with the crores of poor in our country. I felt like telling these wealthy men that they will not be free until they abjure their wealth for the nation and consider themselves as trustees of national wealth." In this speech he also advised people never to use any bad language against the British officials and to be ever ready to suffer and sacrifice for the ideal of independence. Since coming to India in 1915 up to death of Tilak - 1920, he led a number of movements conceived by him and had become the country's greatest leader.

By the time Tilak was freed from Mandalay and Gandhi came to India from Africa, the First World War had started. The British expected the Indians to help them. England had expressed its willingness to give greater freedom to India at the end of the war. Tilak was not ready to trust mere promises, but Gandhi was willing to trust the English and to co-operate with them. That is why the people regarded Tilak as aggressive and Gandhi as moderate. The government regarded Tilak as its enemy but Gandhi as its friend. In 1918 Delhi meeting called by the Viceroy for co-operation, Gandhi was an invitee, but Tilak was not. In 1919 Tilak was included in the representation that visited England for demanding *Swarajya*; and while he was still there, Gandhi gave a call for countrywide *Satyagraha* against Roulette Act between 6th and 13th April 1919. The movement was countrywide and was larger than an earlier one. This movement convinced the people of Gandhi's great aggressiveness and the British ceased to look upon him as a friend. Hereafter people lost their attraction for the moderates. People appreciated Gandhi's aggressive movements against the British rule, though his weapon was only non-violent Satyagraha. Whenever Tilak or Gandhi was tried by the British court of justice, the former challenged the law while the latter believed in persuasion. During the next twentyfive years politics followed the Gandhian course.

◆

## 2

# Politics for Power or for Nation?

Tilak died in 1920 and the same day at the Nagpur Congress the country's political leadership passed into Gandhi's 'hands. But even during the preceding five-and-half years Gandhi had established himself as a peer to Tilak in the political arena. Tilak had played a decisive role in concluding Lucknow pact with the Muslim League - the pact that proved so ruinous to the country. The essence of the pact was an appeasement of Muslims to enable a unanimous demand to be placed before the British at the time of the Montague-Chelmsford Commission for fresh political reforms. The pact contained two conditions. (1) For any bill pertaining to Muslims, to be admitted for discussion, 75% of Muslim legislators must give their consent. (2) The number of Muslim members in the Assemblies were fixed but their number in the Central Legislative must be one third of the total elected Indians. This pact bestowed a right of veto on the Muslims in connection with any act which affected them. In the Central Legislative they got representation one-and-half times what their population percentage justified. And in provincial legislatives, proportional to their population, from 163% it was raised to the fantastic 349%.

It is questionable whether the need for extra rights was so pressing as to justify this extraordinary price paid in the form of such a disproportionate weightage to Muslims. In less than 3 years after this pact, the whole country was called upon to support wholeheartedly the Outlandish Khilaphat movement. Was such an appeasement of Muslims necessary to win Muslim support in the fight for *Swarajya*?

## Agitations earlier to Independence

The five year history detailed so far describes the movement and the *Hindu*-Muslim unity (or otherwise) efforts. This was done just to show how Gandhian era commenced. Apart from Gandhi and Congress there were many other individuals, institutions and events which have left an indelible imprint on the period 1920 to 1947, Bolshevik revolution took place in Russia in October 1917. This had its effect in India. Communists started their work here under the leadership of Dange. There were men like Motilal Nehru and Chittaranjan Das (who were Gandhi's contemporaries) and others like Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Vitthalbhai Patel, Babu Rajendra Prasad and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru (who were Gandhi's followers) who did not agree with Gandhi's continued non-co-operation and Council boycott. They formed a class which would sometimes enter Councils but would stay out at other times. In 1933, Congress Socialist Party was formed within the Congress; the leaders were Jai Prakash Narayan, Achyutrao Patwardhan, Ram Manohar Lohia and Acharya Narendra Dev. The ideal of this party was to combine Russian Communism with American Democracy. Subhash Chandra was a man of great intellectual independence; he did not appreciate Gandhiji's ways based on mysticism and inner voice. Manavendra Nath Roy was disillusioned about Russian communism and had put forward his revolutionary humanism. Swatantryaveer Savarkar was freed from Andaman Jail and brought to Ratnagiri with no permission to leave that place. From his deep study of politics, Muslims and Hindus, there emerged his philosophy of Hinduism. But until 1937 when the restrictions on him were removed, he could not actively participate in politics. Dr. Moonje and Dr. Mookherji joined Savarkar in his efforts to awaken the Hindus. Jinnah cashed upon the Congress urge, to get Muslim co-operation at any cost, to secure more and more rights for Muslims. Following in the foot-steps of the earlier revolutionaries, Bhagat Singh, Rajguru and Gogate started revising the revolutionary way to oust the British. Subhash Chandra Bose, a one time Congress President, slipped out of India and secured Japanese help and organised Azad Hind Fouj. The untouchables and other classes, repressed for over centuries, awakened and a revolutionary leadership arose in the from of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar. Briefly, the whole country was galvanised into activity and there was a large number of young men and women who were willing to stake their all for the country, the people, the repressed, the farmers and factory workers. And due to this atmosphere in the country and under pressure of the world circumstances it was writing on the wall that this country will be independent, in the near future. Various movements for social reform and education of women started. It was at this time that Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh began to get a firm hold in the public mind; the RSS, as later years proved, was destined to grow from strength to strength. Thrice in ten years Gandhi took recourse to Satyagraha and though every Satyagraha lasted for a brief 6 to 12 months, the movement for Swaraj reached every nook and corner of the country. While guiding these Satyagrahas, Gandhi also gave the people several other programmes like *Swadeshi*, *Swavalamban* and '*Nai Talim*', Removal of Untouchability, Village cleaning, Khaddar, Village Industries and Cow Protection. Through such activities, was built up his all pervading top leadership. It cannot be said that the entire populace participated in Gandhiji's movements. This is because, due to Sayyed Ahmed's preachings, the Muslims kept away right to the end. The Hindus were fighting for independence, were studying economic problems connected with socialism, were furthering its education and were hoping to wipe out the social blot of untouchability. And all this, while the Muslims contended themselves with a status quo; but at the same time they tried to grab the maximum possible share of political power sometimes by threats and often by exploiting Hindus' burning desire for freedom. In 1935, Muslims successfully persuaded the government to separate the Muslim majority Sindh from the then Bombay province and paved the way for Pakistan.

The socialist group remained inside in the Congress. What this socialist group did in this period for the preservation of Indian national feeling is noteworthy. In those days, the young Indians, like the young generation throughout the world, were very much enamoured of the Russian communism and Karl Marx's dialectic materialism; and the Communist Party here, taking its cue from the Comminform, taught extra-national loyalty in an attempt to make Indians toe the Russian line. But the Socialist Party attracted a large group of young people to itself. Gandhi was disinclined to disturb the vested interests of the capitalists and zamindars here and so Congress was not willing to fight against the exploitation of the factory workers and farmers. Communists took up this anti-exploitation work and in a city like Bombay started strikes. The young generation, naturally, felt drawn to the communists; but the Socialist Party largely checked this flow. In the Quit India movement of the Congress in 1942, the communists opposed the movement as per their Russian mentors. But socialists backed the movement and came to be respected by the young people. The communists' image in the public mind was that of Russian camp followers.

### *Hindu Mahasabha*: **Inception and Status**

*Hindu Mahasabha* started in Punjab. In 1901, an Act, pertaining to purchase of land and called land Alienation Act, was enforced in Punjab. The law prohibited the purchase of lands to the backward communities by the advanced communities. The commercial communities among the Hindus were styled the advanced communities while the Jats, so called lower caste Hindus and all Muslims were styled as the backward communities. Therefore, if any poor *Hindu* was forced by circumstances to sell his land, he had no alternative but to sell it to a rich Muslim and so the lands of poor Hindus began to pass into the hands of rich Muslims. When Morle-Minto reforms arrived in 1902, the right to vote was based on the size of the land owned. While the Muslim population was less than that of the Hindus, they had proportionately a large number of qualified voters and so Muslim legislators in the Assembly also increased.

The Hindus raised their voice against this injustice but it was of no avail, as the British clearly sided with the Muslims. Surprisingly, the Congress also connived at the injustice. The *Hindu* leaders of Punjab held a general meeting of Hindus at Lahore (1909) and formed Punjab *Hindu Sabha.* Lala Lajpatrai was present. The Sabha had not yet assumed an All India body. Punjab *Hindu* Sabha held six successive annual sessions and engaged itself both in politics and also social work. The Sabha in its session at Haridwar in 1915 assumed an All India status. Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya and Swami Shraddhananda (then just Lala Munshiram) were present. The Lucknow pact which Tilak favoured to woo the Muslims, was opposed by Malaviya and Dr. Moonje. Congress followed a policy of the political appeasement of Muslims, but the *Hindu Mahasabha* could not effectively counter it and the main reason for this was that the Hindus, out of their natural love for freedom, were willing to give the Muslims more than their due as a price. Another factor contributing to this failure was the extraordinary charisma of Gandhiji. The work of the *Hindu Mahasabha* began to grow only after the restrictions on Savarkar not to leave Ratnagiri were lifted. Savarkar was a revolutionary and he believed that no people so far got their freedom without an armed struggle. He considered Lokmanya Tilak as his political *Guru*. In 1910, he was sentenced to two terms of life-imprisonment and he was sent to the Andamans. In 1921, he was transferred from Andamans successively to Ratnagiri and Yervada jails. In 1924 he was set free on the twin conditions that he would not participate in politics and that he would not go out of the Ratnagiri district. He devoted these 14 years to a deep study and wrote the Book '*Hindu*tva' and he put forward a political philosophy for Hindus.

The government divided Bengal (1905) to make the province a Muslim majority province and it enacted and enforced the Alienation Act in Punjab to give Muslims a majority in the Punjab Assembly. In addition to this divisive British policy, the Congress executed the Lucknow pact in 1916 and sponsored the Khilaphat movement which led to the loot, arson and murder let loose on Hindus by Muslims in

954 04092
JOG-P

पुस्तकालय
165785
गुरुकुल कांगड़ी विश्वविद्यालय

Kerala. To crown it all, the Congress, under the mentor-ship of Gandhiji adopted as a faith the absolute necessity of *Hindu*-Muslim unity. These acts of British government and the Muslim appeasement policy of the Congress made it inevitable for Savarkar to advocate *Hindu* Nationalism, *Hindu* organisation and Hinduness. But until 1937, when he was fully free, he could only work for *Hindu* organisation, within the limits of the social reforms. By 1937, however, circumstances had worsened much more. In 1935, Sindh became separate and a Muslim majority province. Under the leadership of Jinnah, the Muslims were pressing more and more demands and the Congress was rapidly yielding ground. The Congress ideal was to create a new Hindi Nation on the basis of territorial Nationalism; while appeasing Muslims, Congress failed to see that it was cutting the very roots of its own ideal. As per the new constitution of 1935, there were elections at the beginning of 1937 and in six out of eleven provinces Congress had secured majority. In four provinces there were front or mixed ministries. In Punjab, the ministry was formed by the Unionist Party of Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan. In 11 provinces there were 485 seats for Muslims. Out of these, the Muslim candidates sponsored by Congress could win only 26 seats which means that Congress represented less than six per cent Muslims. It was Hindus who had strongly supported the Congress. This was the political situation by the middle of 1937 when Savarkar started his political work. Later he did his best to avoid the division of India. Dr. Shyamaprasad Mookherji did in Bengal what Savarkar was doing in the political field. But neither of them succeeded in avoiding the Division of India.

### Muslim League Grows in Strength

In the 1937 elections, the League secured 108 out of 485 reserved Muslim seats. But apart from the 26 seats secured by the Congress, all the remaining 351 seats went to different Muslim organisations. In the decade that followed, the League became stronger. In 1940, the League demanded Pakistan and thus won the leadership of all Muslims. The Second World War had commenced. The Congress refused to co-operate with the British in their war effort and further passed the "Quit India" resolution and also started individual Satyagraha. League supported the government and also pressed for several demands. In particular, they demanded that no Indian forces be used against any Muslim nation. This demand clearly exposed their extra-India loyalty. Savarkar could foresee the likely Muslim excesses against Hindus and accordingly advised *Hindu* youths to enter the forces and be prepared to protect the Hindus. By 1945, the British were victorious in the war, the Muslims had acquired a very high friendly status with the government and all the Muslims had united under the banner of the League as was clearly indicated by the results of 1945 elections. All the Muslim seats of the Central Legislative were captured by League. In wards, not reserved for Muslims, the *Hindu* vote in favour of the Congress was 91% and this meant that Congress was the body which represented the Hindus. Does this mean that Hindus upheld the Congress policy which would lead to formation of Pakistan? No. Because the 1942 Congress resolution of *Akhand Bharat* had opposed the League resolution of 1940 demanding Pakistan. This Congress Session was held at Allahabad and Lala Jagat Narayan (Punjab) had proposed the *Akhand Bharat* resolution. (Lala Jagat Narayan, Editor of a Daily Punjab Kesari is the same man who was murdered in 1981 by the Sikh extremists.) At the time of 1945 elections also the *Akhand Bharat* resolution of Congress was there. The Congress started yielding ground to the anti-national demands of Muslims and did not stop this sliding downhill until Pakistan was granted 30 years later. This is the history upto Independence. Savarkar strongly opposed this Muslim appeasement by the Congress and Dr. Ambedkar also knew about the anti-national nature of the Muslims. Dr. Ambedkar was thoroughly dissatisfied with the Varna classification in Hinduism and the inhuman treatment meted out to the untouchables for centuries; he therefore decided to abjure Hinduism. The Muslims and the Christians tried to woo him and his followers to their faiths. While refusing their offers he said, "The change of religion by the untouchables will have grave consequences on the country. If they embrace Islam or Christianity they will become anti-national. If they become Muslims, the Muslims will double their number and their domination will increase several-fold. If they become Christians, Christian population will rise to 6 crores and the British strangle-hold will be tighter still." 20 years later Dr. Ambedkar embraced *Bouddha* religion which had its roots in this land and its culture and he thus prevented his followers from becoming anti-Indian nationals. So far we have reviewed what thinkers and leaders from Raja Rammohan Roy to Dr. Ambedkar felt about Muslims and Muslim-power during the country's history up to independence. Was this subject given proper thought even after the Independence? Later in this book, we shall consider Pandit Deendayalji's thoughts in this connection.

## Independence - Initial Period

On the 1st Independence Day, a representative of the All India Radio approached Gandhiji to request for his message to the Nation and Gandhiji replied that future appeared dark to him. These were the Mahatmaji's words when independence dawned after an uninterrupted 90 years of struggle with a longing in the *Hindu* hearts that God should lead them from the gloom of slavery to light of independence. But Pandit Nehru felt differently.

For a whole year, just preceding independence he had been the Prime Minister in the transition government. Being formal head of government for a year, he had acquired first hand knowledge of the country's problems and so felt the confidence to be able to solve them. Independence was but a step, though an important one, on the way to a good and just government. The country's defence, the welfare of the masses, peoples' rights, elimination of unemployment, mass-education and many other problems faced the nation. Except Muslims all had been willing to sacrifice for independence. And now after independence, it was the duty of Nehru as Prime Minister and of the Congress as main political party to inspire the people to even greater sacrifice in order to utilise independence to achieve Rama Rajya of Gandhiji's dream. The great question is whether at least a beginning was made in this direction. Unfortunately the question has to be answered in the negative. The veracity of this answer will be clear from a review of the post-independence period until 1951 when Pandit Deendayalji arrived on the political scene. Within two months of the arrival of independence and the division of India, Pakistan attacked Kashmir. Pakistan pretended that it was the Muslim tribesmen (from Northern India) who had attacked. But it soon became clear that the tribes were prompted and militarily supported by Pakistan. The armed Muslim rioters of British period had been consolidated into a war-mongering nation. But Pandit Nehru failed to deploy Indian army straight away to oust the Pakistanis. Kashmir king approached Nehru for military help, but strangely the latter asked the king Maharaja Hari Singh to hand over all political power to Sheikh Abdullah prior to sending Indian Army there. Shri V.P. Menon, the able and principled administrator, very close to Sardar Patel and Secretary to Home Department, has written, "From the time of Mahmood Gazni, there have been aggressions on India from the northwest; and Pakistan just two and a half months after its creation, did attack India from the north-west. Today it is Shrinagar, tomorrow it may be Delhi. Any nation which forgets its history or geography is prone to such disasters." It may be noted here that Menon was neither a follower of Savarkar or Ambedkar nor an enemy of Nehru or Congress.

During this period i.e. the last part of 1949, East Pakistan started genocide of Hindus. *Hindu* lands, houses and women were insecure. There was a *Hindu* exodus from Pakistan to India. At the time of the division of India, Nehru had undertaken the responsibility of 'protecting the minority (Hindus) in Pakistan'. He utterly failed in this; instead he concluded a sham pact - the notorious Nehru-Liaquat Ali Pact - and while justifying this ineffective pact, in the Parliament said, "Some people feel that to solve this problem, we should use military force; but this will be a mistake. It is also wrong to exchange populations because it will undermine the stand we have taken for 30 years prior to independence. The third alternative is that of talks with Pakistan and we are doing just that." These words of Nehru clearly expose the policy of Independent *Bharat* in dealing with Pakistan and Muslim goondaism in general.

Earlier Justice Ranade, Dadabhai Naoroji and Tilak had clarified how the British rule was exploiting the country. After independence the government started economic planning to stop this exploitation. A mixed economy was adopted; it gave scope to private enterprise while placing heavy and basic industries in the government i.e. public sector. Side by side attempts were made to free tillers from the yoke of Zamindars, to free the bonded labour and to raise farm production. To combine social justice with economic progress, it was necessary to enact new laws and enforce them with discretion. For this purpose, Nehru and Congress should have sought national co-operation and planned to utilise independence to usher in a benevolent rule or *Rama Rajya*. During the struggle for independence, *Swadeshi* (use of indigenous goods) had become a vow and sacrifice a second nature. After independence the adherence to the vow and the spirit of sacrifice began to disappear. It is the usual policy of countries, that have newly become free, to import technology and update industries, to increase the skills of the indigenous labour and thus to step up the pace of industrialisation. But instead of doing this, our government opened our doors to foreign capital. At the beginning of the first Five Year Plan, Nehru had said, "Ninety-six per cent of our people are economically backward." And to remove this backwardness, government invested in all sorts of things from Umbar Charkha to National Chemical Laboratory. But all these became government enterprises instead of becoming peoples' enterprises because Nehru did not remain any more the independence war leader but became the government-chief. The bureaucracy we fought against became the medium for the peoples' good. Previously the order was education of the people, the institution of reforms by the people and finally necessary government enactment to put a seal on it. But this process was replaced in free India by reforms by passing laws. So independence came to be interpreted as government's initiative in people's welfare and also in introducing reforms by laws. All that was left to the people was to organise and agitate for demands of schemes and enactments; this became a set procedure in less than three to four years.

Not that the government did not want people's co-operation in good government but the means adopted for securing this co-operation only added to the size of the bureaucracy. Government started village-development schemes, group-development schemes, Khadi and village industries boards. But only Congressmen were put in charge of all these; the result was that it created a class of 'Gram sevaks' who were of little use to national development but who became the field workers of Congress election machinery. The solitary exception was 'Gopuri', a viable scheme started by Congress idealists. But schemes from 'Neera' production to 'Sarvodaya' all depended on government (financial) support. The result was the creation of a large class of paid servants of average intelligence who concealed their meagre abilities behind a mask of sacrifice.

Bright young men from middle class, born in homes with an educational tradition, termed their 'selfishness' as 'career' and entered all India services; multi-national companies were freely entering the country; various industries which learned on government financial help were cropping up. Those who had understood the all pervasiveness of power, joined as leaders in political and provincial movements. Making five year plans, borrowing money from abroad to finance them and under the attractive title of 'aid', subjecting the country to the economic slavery of foreign industries. This is the kind of atmosphere which filled the country's atmosphere - thanks to the work of the party in power.

This was the situation in the country when Pandit Deendayalji entered politics. In this connection it is useful to mention some important events during 3 or 4 years. With independence came country's division and the exodus of the displaced persons from Pakistan: Mahatma Gandhi was murdered resulting in Savarkar's incarceration and eclipsing of *Hindu Mahasabha*. Pakistan attacked Kashmir and it was obvious that we had given rise to an enemy nation. Nehru-Liaquat pact was concluded in 1950 but it solved no problem. Christians in Kerala destroyed 105 *Hindu* temples including the famous Shabarimalai temple; they had not dared to do this even during the British rule. Communists insurrected openly in Telangana. The socialists came out of the Congress and started functioning as a separate party. China came to be ruled by communists. The Chinese government established their hegemony in Tibet and demonstrated its expansionist designs. The first Five Year Plan commenced and village industries, village development and other schemes were put into operation. In the first national ministry, Nehru included Dr. Ambedkar and Dr. Mookherji to create a facade of a non-one party government; but both these great leaders soon discovered the over-riding authority and attitude of Nehru and so resigned from their ministries. In various provinces there were movements, led by Congressmen, for creation of provinces on language basis.

**Inception of *JanaSangh***

Thus commenced a period in *Bharat's* history wherein there were several problems and challenges; government sponsored schemes were attracting people for reconstruction; opportunities were present in both private and public sectors; the country was divided but the causes for the division were still present; foreign capital and loans were flowing in under the name of aid; and bureaucracy expanded vastly. Even five years after independence, the progress was meagre. This is when Pandit Deendayalji entered the political arena. It was more than a year since Dr. Shyamaprasad Mookherji had resigned from Central ministry in protest of Nehru-Liaquat pact and the do nothing government policy vis-a-vis the hordes of Hindus displaced from Pakistan. General elections were due in another six months. Deendayalji was a RSS Pracharak; the ban on RSS had been lifted and RSS had become conscious that there were no legislators in the country who would hold up RSS cause. Dr. Mookherji's intense *Hindu*ness, his extensive political experience and insight and his sharp intelligence combined with the large organised strength of RSS to give birth to *Jana Sangh*. Panditji was appointed Organising Secretary for Uttar Pradesh in October 1951. From this time to his murder in 1968, Deendayalji devoted himself entirely to *Jana Sangh* work. In 1952 he became the All India Organising Secretary of *Jana Sangh*. He could observe Dr. Mookherji as a leader at close quarters. He was at that time in his mid-thirties. In June 1953, Dr. Mookherji died in Kashmir jail in very suspicious circumstances and the entire responsibility of young *Jana Sangh* fell on Panditji's shoulders. He was to shape *Jana Sangh*. Getting power is an inevitable step in politics. But the important question is what is the power to be used for? Power to perpetuate power, power for selfish ends, power for party's sake? What did Deendayalji want political power for?

It is useful to consider Panditji's background. He came into contact with RSS in his student days and as soon as he finished his college education, he devoted himself fully to RSS work. Before he crossed 35 years of age he was made Sah-Prant Pracharak of the vast UP. He joined *Jana Sangh* at the behest of RSS and was made organisational secretary for UP and the very next year (1952) he was shouldering the same responsibility on an All India basis. He had the benefit of political guidance from Dr. Mookherji who was a seasoned' politician, an expert parliamentarian and above all a great patriot. For Deendayalji, the nation was his God. Such was his ability that Dr. Mookherji had said of him, "Give me two Deendayals and I shall wholly transform *Bharat*."

But as destiny would have it, Dr. Mookherji went to Kashmir jail never to return and the entire burden fell on Deendayalji. The answer to the question - 'What did he do politics for?' is 'He did for the nation.' He desired that political power should go into such hands as will use it for the nation's good. He was sorry that none in the country was doing this and so he was striving that *Bharatiya Jana Sangh* should take it up. In one place he has said, 'The most important thing for the all-sided national development is independence - not merely political but economic, social and mental. *Bharatiya Jana Sangh* is not just an alternative to any party, but it is a movement of men with an ideal and a new vision. This is why *Jana Sangh* does not oppose any party just for the sake of opposition; it will not stoop low merely to pull down Congress from power. *Jana Sangh*'s life-mission is to carry the nation rapidly on the path of progress." Deendayalji did not want power by crooked and lowly means. Naturally he would not try to benefit his party by cornering the ruling party in a national calamity. Thus in 1962 (Chinese agression) he unconditionally withdrew the farmers' agitation in UP and saved the country from a north-south split by not adopting a stiff stand on the language issue. As against this, Nehru himself started the practice of pressing for his own views or of looking to his party interests even in times of national calamities. Two examples of this may be cited. In October 1947, Pakistan attacked Kashmir. The Maharaja of Kashmir requested New Delhi for military aid against the aggression. The aid was delayed till Pakistani army arrived at the very gates of Shrinagar. Reason for this delay? Nehru asked the Maharaja to sign the amalgamation of Kashmir with *Bharat*. But this was not the only precondition. The other was that the Maharaja should immediately abjure all power and hand it over to his friend Sheikh Mohammed Abdulla, the leader of the Muslim Conference there. Nehru's first duty was to repulse the Pak attack, but instead of this he exploited the situation in favour of his party and his friend. The second example is that of Kerala (which at that time was Travancore-Cochin), where the Christians did what they did not dare even during the British regime. The Christians destroyed 105 *Hindu* Temples including the famous Shabarimalai temple. Nehru did nothing to punish these Christians or to restore the temple for the simple reason that Nehru cared more for retention of power i.e. for his assured Christian block vote. The Hindus, however, reacted by coming together under the banner of *Hindu Mahamandalam* to counter the Christian and Muslim aggression. Nehru, whose politics was for power, went personally to Kerala before 1952 elections and manoeuvred a split in the Mahamandal by offering Congress tickets to some, by driving a wedge between the Ezhava and Nair communities and by offering chief-minister-ship to R. Shankar who was an Ezhava leader of the Mahamandal. It took the Hindus 30 years before they could close their ranks again.

## Deendayalji's Politics - A Need of the Times

On this background of Nehru's politics for the party, the country needed a party which did politics in nation's interest. Nobody expected the Communist Party to work primarily for this nation. The Socialist Party was anti-*Hindu* and pro-Muslim and the party had backed Nehru both in his actions in Kashmir and Kerala. The political parties then in existence fell into two groups. The Congress, the Socialist and the Praja Socialist Party of Kripalani and Ranga-the last two were fragments of Congress and similar to Congress - these formed one group. In the other group were the Communist Party and the Shetkari Kamgar Party which was similar to the former. These two formed the second group. Both these groups were similar in that they gave top priority to securing and remaining in power, national interest having a lower priority. The country's need was a party which gave top priority to national interest. *Jana Sangh* was born to fulfil this need. *Jana Sangh* organised a national democratic front in Parliament under the leadership of Dr. Mookherji; this front included *Jana Sangh. Hindu* Mahasabha, Akali Dal, Ganatantra Parishad, Tamil Nadu Shramik Party, Commonweal Party, Dravid Kazagam, Loksevak Sangh, parties of different shades and from different parts of the country. Dr. Mookherji also organised, outside the Parliament, a larger front on the question of the Hindus displaced from Pakistan. On the Kashmir issue *Jana Sangh* started an agitation, under the leadership of Dr. Mookherji and gave it an all India form. Even before *Jana Sangh* responsibility came to be shouldered by Deendayalji, the *Jana Sangh* politics was different from that of Congress or Communists-the emphasis was less on power, more on national work.

Deendayalji observed that the politicians of the day were interested in short-term gains. He based his *Jana Sangh* policies on eternal values with a long-term view of things. Consider for example, his thoughts in his book 'Rashtra Chintan'. He says, "If we consider the agitations during the last half century, it will be seen that their basic principles are of doubtful veracity. The fundamental mistake of the politicians has been their faith in the existence of different classes here; they therefore try to use them in national interest. All along their efforts have been directed to create co-operation and unity among them. Such classes do not really exist, but these classes were assumed to be there and their separatism was fomented in an attempt to find patchwork solutions. The attempts have all failed.

"During the British regime we supposed that Christians, Muslims and so on are different classes here and national feeling can be nurtured while accepting these classes. This classification based on differences in sects and methods of worship has nothing to do with nationality. There has been class wise division of the Indian polity on linguistic and economic basis and that we have to forge a unity of these classes, whose existence has been taken for granted and build *Bharatiya* nationalism on it. The federal nature of the Indian Constitution is the result of this mistake.

"On economic basis different classes are imagined to exist such as Zamindars and the farmers, capitalists and the factory workers, the exploiters and the exploited. The attempt is either to support the one and repress the other or at best to try to bring about a mutual understanding between them.

"Out of political expediency, politicians assume existence of these classes. So long as the politicians fuel their egotism and selfishness, the politics can be said to be misdirected. The truth is that the whole of *Bharat* is one and the people are one and the people must feel this. The different organs cannot be synthesized into the human body; the body is a whole and the organs are its parts. This is why every organ works for the whole body. Similarly the various organs of a nation must shape themselves to suit the national interests. The sects, provinces and languages are all important but only so long as they are favourable to national interest. If they are not so, they must be sacrificed in national interest.

"The first thought presupposes that the differences are inherent and that a unity must be forged. The second thought (that of *Jana*

*Sangh*) implies that there is an underlying unity and the apparent diversity is its multiple expressions. The great misfortune of this country is that those who control it today have adopted the former view. Until and unless this basic mistake is rectified, *Bharat* cannot stand on a sure foundation." Deendayalji has been quoted at length above to set forth his political inspirations and convictions. Kashmir problem, the problem of the displaced people from Pakistan, food problem, foreign capital, five year plans, linguistic provinces, Hindi versus English, North versus South, growing poverty and unemployment, Chinese aggression and India's defeat, Kachchha-pact, Tashkand pact, war with Pakistan, increasing riots in the country, industrial unrest, anarchy in education, the regimes of Shastriji and Indira Gandhi, the multi-party provincial governments - these and several other problems cropped up during his 16 years of political career. He cared not for cheap popularity but remained a true nationalist and led many agitations to organise *Jana Sangh* and educate the people. We shall be seeing his activities in greater details in the rest of the book.

* * *

## 3

# The Language of *Swarajya* Must be *Swabhasha*

One of the aspirations that naturally arose after independence was the creation of linguistic provinces. In 1923 Congress had passed a resolution favouring such creation and Sindh was formed on Sindhi language basis, even earlier to independence, though of course the British clandestine motive was different. At its Kanpur session in 1952, *Jana Sangh* demanded redemarcation of provinces and the appointment of a three member committee for this purpose. It was also demanded that two of the members should be judges from High Courts or the Supreme Court. The resolution in this connection also said, "Different parts are demanding reconstruction of provinces on language and certain other criteria while redemarcating provinces, there must be taken into account, administrative convenience, economic stability, language, progress of the country as a whole and defence-requirements." It was in this session that Dr. Mookherji himself appointed Deendayalji as the General Secretary of *Jana Sangh*.

After Dr. Mookherji's death, *Jana Sangh* session took place at Bombay in 1954. Deendayalji now became the chief mentor of the party and all the resolutions reflected his thinking. The government was congratulated on the appointment of a commission for State-reconstruction. It was also suggested that the national executive of

*Jana Sangh* should appoint a committee to submit a suitable memorandum to the commission.

### *Swabhasha* Is Inevitable

Often it is thought that language should be the sole criterion for demarcating provinces. Deendayalji thought that language is basically a means of bringing people together, a means of thought expression, a means of cultural evolution. Our large country has several languages but all the same, there is only one culture. And so while reconstructing provinces, language cannot be the only factor to consider. Linguistic minority is a wrong notion and is a hindrance in national integration. The Lok Sabha faced the problem of the language for administration. The Constitution had decided that Hindi would be the language of administration, but it has also provided that, as a transitional measure, English also may be continued for 15 years. So it was the duty of the government to develop both Hindi and the other provincial languages adequately to suit administrative requirements. But Nehru himself was so much in favour of English that he did precious little to accelerate development of Hindi and the Central Education Minister Abul Kalam Azad did his best to hinder its progress. In the matter of coining technical terms in Hindi. Nehru declared in Parliament, "Words must be evolved. To create such Hindi equivalent words mechanically is artificial, foolish, one sided and ridiculous….." With these words he swept aside Hindi and also other Indian Languages. His principal attack was on Sanskritised Hindi and against sawants like Dr. Raghuvir who minted various new good terms for Hindi. Nehru ridiculed any new idea, repugnant to him, by showering abuses like fantastic, non-sense, absurd, laughable, unrealistic, communal, medieval etc. Deendayalji countered Nehru's fusillade by raising a number of issues. (1) Suppose that several English terms are used as they are, what about the derivatives of these words. Shall we also adopt them? If this clumsy thing is done, will an average Indian understand them? (2) If we give up Sanskrit, what will be the technical language for different subjects in different provincial languages? (3) Do we stick to English for ever or do we create new technical terminology for each

165785

provincial language? (4) It is true that some English words have become common usage and nobody says that they should be banished. But in law and in social and other sciences each original word gives rise to a number of others to express various shades of meaning. Take for example the word 'judge'. It leads to the words judiciary, judicial, judgment, judgeship, judicature, judicious, adjudge, adjudicate, prejudge, prejudice, justice, justifiable, judiciary, justify, justification, jury, juror, jurisdiction, juridical, jurist, jurisprudence etc. Shall we use all these derivatives, as they are, in Indian languages? If you want Hindi to be the official language and use it for law, legislatures and administration, then there is no escape from deriving the necessary words from original Sanskrit roots. Is it a fault of learned men like Dr. Raghuvir to mechanically derive such words? (5) Nehru had said that words should not be mechanically derived like coins in a mint. While replying to this objection Deendayalji said, "It is true that several words are evolved out of the speech of common men. But the expectations from Hindi and other languages in the new set up cannot be at all adequately met by this process. For example, the so called Hindustani (Urduised Hindi) words for Governor and President are respectively 'Latsaheb' and 'Bada latsaheb'. Are they to be continued or replaced by 'Rajyapal' and 'Rashtrapati'? The words, Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha, have not evolved from common man's talk. But having had their origin in a 'mechanical mint', have they now not got current? (6) Nehru hated Sanskritised Hindi and was in favour of Urduized Hindi i.e. Hindustani. About this Deendayalji said, "Hindustani is not easy and not understandable to the common man. Gandhi accepted Hindustani because he wanted to appease Muslims; that is why he mixed Hindi with Urdu words to and artificially created Hindustani. Nobody understands Nehru's Hindustani south of Narmada and Moulana Azad's Hindustani is ununder-standable even in UP; only those who had their education in Urdu can follow it. Last year, when the word 'Kritrim Nabhomandal' was used as an equivalent to 'Planetarium', Nehru lost his temper; but he failed to suggest an alternative and who can say that a Persian equivalent word would have been easier to understand?

Briefly, Gandhi abused the language issue for his political expediency. Deendayalji, on the other hand, looked at it purely from the national point of view. He did not care if the protagonism for Hindi would give him an image of a medieval man and an upholder of priesthood, nor did he care if this would cost him any loss of Muslim votes; Deendayalji respected all the Indian languages. But he could not bear the idea that English should be imposed on the country; it was foreign and not more than one per cent of the masses understood it.

The imposition of English was ruinous for the country. His quarrel was with those who raised a bogey of Hindi. While explaining how English had throttled all Indian languages he said, "If English goes, its place will be taken not only by Hindi but by all Indian languages. If English continues, no. Indian language can develop. Tamil and Bengali were driven out from their own provinces not by Hindi but by English. In the Legislative Assembly and administration in Kerala, for example, when English goes, its place will be taken by Malayalam and not by Hindi. Hindi will be used only on the all India level."

To those who argued in favour of English by saying that English is a rich language with new words for new science, he said, "English must go because it is a question of our national honour even as the British Rule had to go in spite of some of its virtues for the simple reason that the rule was foreign. We thirsted for *Swarajya* and the thirst cannot be satisfied by even *Surajya* (good rule) if the rule is foreign. Our thirst for *Swabhasha* (our language) cannot be quenched by *Subhasha* (a good language).

**Linguistic Provinces-Discretion**

Communists and many small parties had recourse to violence while agitating for linguistic provinces because their primary aim was power and not national interest. In a meeting at Shivaji Park in Bombay, Bhai Dange had said, "We will accept Chinese *Hatti* (elephant) but not *Jatti* (a Kannada leader) from Mysore." The audience was at such a low level of discretion that it did not protest against the speaker. Deendayalji never regarded the provinces as neither separate entities nor that was the central government a synthetic product or a federation. He was for an *ekatma* (=essentially having a common ethos) constitution and the nearest but not exact equivalent English term for it was unitary constitution. Like Tilak he accepted 'what was' but never gave up striving for 'what was necessary'. Out of this attitude did Deendayalji submit a memorandum to the Province-reconstruction Commission? He declared in no uncertain terms that Bombay must go to Maharashtra, but opposed the demand for separate Vidarbha.

All know the sham patriotism of communists who welcomed the Chinese elephant. Few saw through the game of using language for balkanisation of India. They could not bear to use language to unite the people. When the country was divided to form Pakistan, it was naturally decided to take a referendum on the fate of Sylhet district. The district had 60% *Hindu* population but these 60% Hindus were-some Bangla speaking and some Assamiya speaking. The Bengali speaking Hindus favoured Pakistan as they considered that language was a much stronger bond than Hinduness. The folly bore disastrous fruit. Sylhet went to Pakistan and it was these self same Bengali speaking Hindus who were robbed, often murdered and dishonoured by the Pakistani Muslims and had to seek asylum in Hindusthan. The Linguistic provinces agitations in India were marked by violence and hatred among Hindus. But nowhere did Muslims fought among themselves and the Muslims were everywhere busy consolidating Muslim majority areas as in the creation of Mallapuram district in Kerala. Akali Dal in Punjab pressed its demand for Punjabi Suba. Punjab was not geographically divided in Punjabi speaking and Hindi speaking areas. Most towns and villages had almost equal numbers who spoke Punjabi and Hindi. Only four years earlier (at the time of Pak-creation) Punjab, which had five rivers flowing through it, had been reduced to a small size claiming only two rivers. It was thus difficult to create two provinces out of this small Indian Punjab because neither would be viable economically. Secondly, such a fragmentation was very dangerous from the defence point of view. Thirdly, it would have led to bitter fights in towns and villages. The all India representative body of *Jana Sangh* in its session in 1955 had warned, "This is a stratagem of Akali Dal to create a communal theocratic state under the garb of a linguistic province. It is not a general demand of all Punjabis but that of only Akali Dal Sikhs. *Jana Sangh* wishes to point out to the nation that if this language based fissiparous tendency is not nipped in the bud, there is the danger of a repetition of 1947 events again. If Akali Dal demand is accepted, it will set in motion the fragmentation of India." This resolution says further, 'Instead of severely repressing this divisive demand of Akali Dal, Congress in Punjab, under the behest of Congress High Command, is yielding to the Akali Dal." The *Jana Sangh* fears have come to be true now after 30 years.

Punjabi Suba was formed then, not heeding the *Jana Sangh* warning. And now Khalistan is on its way. 30 years back, Master Tara Singh visited Pakistan (to tap its support) and now Punjab is full of Paki agents. Language can unite. But if discretion is lost, selfishness goes unchecked, patriotism dries up, party comes to be regarded greater than the nation and language becomes a tool for divisive ends. The Reconstruction commission had clearly reported that further division of Punjab was impossible. But the party in power, out of its political expediency appointed two separate territorial committees, setting aside the Commission's recommendations. The Congress, which in 1952 elections had dubbed Akali Dal as communal, in 1957 elections, just for party's political gains, agreed to Punjabi Suba and split Punjab into Punjab and Haryana.

Formation of linguistic provinces began in 1953 when Potti Ramulu, a Gandhian leader of Congress, went on an indefinite fast in 1953. Potti Ramulu died and Madras saw many violent agitations. In 1949, a plan for appointing separate committees and governments was drawn up, for formation of Andhra Province. But the plan was given up as on certain points the Telugu and Tamil speaking people could not agree. It would have been proper to appoint at that time a commission for creating linguistic provinces. But the Congress always lacked deep basic thinking, top priority to national interest and the democratic respect for and consultation with the opposition parties. Such negative attitude forces people to take recourse to violence as during Andhra's demand for a separate province. Andhra was formed on 1st October 1953.

The Reconstruction commission was instituted and its report was available by middle of 1955. But while adopting the report, changes were made in it for the ruling party's political expediency which led to bitterness and riots in some places. *Jana Sangh* said in its resolution, "Not only for countering the present fissiparous tendencies in the country but also for the country's natural progress an Ekatma' (which may be somewhat translated by the word unitary) Constitution and State-administration are necessary. The events of the last few months have brought home to many thinkers the need for this. The ruling party has no courage to do the necessary Constitutional reform. Even if the present Constitution is to be retained for some time more, the following changes must be made forthwith. (I) The phrase 'Union government' and the word 'state' should be replaced by 'Central government' and 'province' respectively. (2) The common list for Centre and State should be included in Central list, (3) The jurisdictions of the territorial boards must be demarcated in the Constitution itself." The same resolution also demanded that Delhi should be the only centrally administered province.

**Adherence to Principles even at the People's Anger**

Under Deendayalji's guidance Jana Sangh workers participated in people's agitations for linguistic provinces, but they did it not to divide people but to unite them: *Jana Sangh* workers always adopted a national point of view. When it was decided that Nehru was to come to garland the statue of Shivaji Maharaj at Pratapgadh, the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti decided to agitate against Nehru's coming on the ground that he had repudiated the demand for Samyukta Maharashtra. But identifying a National hero like Shivaji Maharaj with a merely provincial issue and preventing the country's highest official from inauguration of the statue was repugnant to

Hindusthan's national sentiment and so *Jana Sangh* opposed the Maharashtra Samiti on this issue. *Jana Sangh* had to face people's wrath throughout Maharashtra and *Jana Sangh* did it in the national interest without yielding to the myopic public view at the time. The principle is contained in a wise Sanskrit saying which lays down 'the ideal is people's ultimate well-being and not sycophancy'. During 1954-60, the period of burning sentiments of the people vis-a-vis the linguistic provinces. Deendayalji stuck to this principle. On this issue *Jana Sangh*, in Maharashtra, quitted the Maharashtra Samiti and had to suffer heavily in the 1962 elections. *Jana Sangh* could not get a single seat either in the provincial Assembly or in the Lok Sabha. Out of its 127 candidates for the Assembly, 100 lost their deposits. *Jana Sangh* paid a heavy price for sticking to its principle of giving top priority to national interest in every question. Linguistic provinces were formed and yet the provincial languages did not become the languages of the provincial state administrations. As further example of political perversion, we may consider the case of the great savant and a top national leader Rajagopalachari. The great educationalist that he was, he inspired lakhs of Tamilians to learn Hindi. But perversion made him an antagonist of Hindi and he went to the extent of ridiculing Hindi by saying that there were only two good books in Hindi literature-one, Tulasi Ramayan and the other, Railway guide. He added a new dimension to the north versus south controversy. In the Calicut session, Deendayalji dispelled South India's fear of Hindi and declared in unequivocal terms that Hindi is not opposed to any provincial language. In his presidential speech he said. "Congress is responsible for not yet replacing English by Hindi in Central administration. Not only this, it has fomented quarrels and raised fears in the use of Hindi. *Jana Sangh* feels that none should be denied any opportunity on the excuse that he or she does not know Hindi. And so we have demanded that Central examinations (Public Service Commission, All India Services etc.) must be conducted in each province in the provincial language and that for no candidate should knowledge of any particular language be made compulsory. During the transmission period, candidates may be permitted to use

English. But it is intolerable that English should continue indefinitely or that Hindi should not be given a trial. The recent passing of the Bill on State language modification is a step in the wrong direction. This will be a hindrance in the way of any province in trying to use the state language in administration. It is quite certain that so long as English dominates Delhi, Madras will not honour Tamil.

### Savarkar on Language

Deendayalji was an active politician. It was thus important that his party should have maximum representation in not only Legislative Assemblies and Lok Sabha but also Gram-panchayats. But he always gave top priority to national interests even in days of bitter linguistic fights. It is interesting to compare his thoughts with those of Savarkar in this connection. Savarkar has said, "We accept Hindi as a national language, but we do neither disrespect any provincial language nor consider it inferior in any way. Like Hindi we love all our provincial languages and hope that they will develop well and become rich. Some of these provincial languages are already highly advanced and rich as compared to Hindi. Even then, taking into account several other facts, it is felt that Hindi is most fitted to become the national language. Even earlier to the coming of Muslims, Hindi had acquired an All India status as a national language. *Hindu* pilgrims, traders, travellers, soldiers and learned men expressed themselves in Hindi as they crossed the country from Bengal to Sindh or from Kashmir to Rameshwaram." While explaining why Hindi has to be Sanskritised, has he said, "Only that language can be the basis of Hindi which has the capacity to generate new words? Barring Sanskrit what other language in the world has the power to coin new words for new ideas and things of the new era? Arabic script and language do not have this ability."

'Hindustani' artificially prepared by Gandhi as per his Vardha scheme is a mixture of languages and is not at all a Sanskrit based language. This demon of a language-Hindustani-must be "ruthlessly shoved aside."

Swatantryaveer Savarkar was opposed to creation of linguistic provinces. He has said, "Province-wise division must depend entirely on the convenience of national administration; this must be the sole criterion. Language unity, historical differences and likes and dislikes may only influence the transitional arrangements. But these are divisive forces and the national policy should be to slowly eliminate them."

The above quotations are enough to show how similar are the thoughts of men who give top priority to national interests in all matters.

* * *

## 4

# Defence Preparedness Has no Alternative

Defence is the most neglected subject in *Bharat*.

Dr. Raghuvir toured Central Asia three decades back. On his return, he gave talks at *Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan* in Bombay. In those talks, he disclosed some special information on various aggressions on *Bharat*. The details he gave in one of the talks would upset any Indian. He said, '"When Babar first came to India, he had only 200 horsemen with him. The village Hindus supplied fodder to his horses and the village ladies served food to his soldiers."

Last 13 centuries we have been extending our hospitality even to our enemies. In internal quarrels, we sought the aid of foreigners. We have employed Muslim mercenaries for protection of Shaniwar Wada and the Indian States have prayed and paid for disciplined British armies for interstate battles. This behaviour is recent history. In very recent times, there came forward the idea of seeking America's military aid in the form of a nuclear umbrella. This is an indication of the persistence of the old suicidal *Hindu* attitude. We have never realised that in the matter of defence, self-reliance is a must. Babar and Rana Sanga fought at Sthaneshwar. Sanga's warriors used spears and spears have a small range. But Babar used fire arms and these had a vastly greater striking range. Babar won. Generations passed but we did nothing to overcome our arms inferiority. The science and technology of weaponry have been neglected for centuries. Hindus crossed the seas to preach *dharma* to the whole world, but they miserably failed to realise the principle that a nation can discuss and propagate real *Dharma* only if it is properly defended with powerful and long-range arms. The modern seer who had thoroughly grasped this truth was Savarkar. Deendayalji was very alive to the problem of defence and had demanded that *Bharat* should acquire nuclear capability. Economists argued against nuclear weapons by saying that *Bharat* cannot afford this; Deendayalji declaimed this by saying that no price is too big for preservation of independence. Foreign policy and defence are inseparably connected. Nehru's foreign policy was that of non-intervention in the internal affairs of any nation, but he never realised that the ultimate criterion of our foreign policy is our nation's good. Nehru could not bear the idea of war and he avoided war with Pakistan losing one-third of Kashmir and avoided war with China losing 35,000 square miles of Indian Territory. When Deendayalji joined politics, Nehru was lecturing to the world on peace while China used military force to swallow up Tibet. Indian army units were assigned to UNO's peace force while foreign armies were occupying Indian Territory from Aksai Chin to Berubari. In his sarcastic speech in a public meeting Jagannathrao Joshi had declared that Nehru was ridiculous; Indian forces were helping UNO's peace mission in foreign lands while the Indian Territory was an undefended prey to foreign invasions.

### Foreign Policy in National Interest

Vis-a-vis foreign policy, Deendayalji has said, "Foreign policy is after all a policy and is not an independent principle. Foreign policy must be decided on the criterion of the advancement and protection of national interest. "Deendayalji's thoughts on defence and foreign policy are perfectly sound from the national point of view. Deendayalji's thoughts were in agreement with those of Savarkar, Subhash Chandra Bose and Dr. Moonje. He was convinced that philosophical and scientific discussions are possible only if a nation is very well defended. Nehru dominated all discussions and resolutions of the

Congress regarding foreign policy, in all matters, be it the Spanish political revolt, or Hitler's aggression on Czechoslovakia, or the policy of apartheid in South Africa or the aggressive movements of General Tojo of Japan. The important point is that Nehru never put the country's interest as the chief consideration in his foreign policy. Gandhi coupled *Swarajya* movement with *Khilafat* movement. Similarly Nehru decided India's foreign policy to suit China's aggression on and subjugation of Tibet; he acquiesced in Chinese claim that Tibet is part of China. Communists were cursing Nehru as "the running dog of imperialism". But when Nehru supported Chinese aggression in Tibet, the same Communists changed and started praising him for his efforts for World Peace.

*Jana Sangh*, on the other hand, attacked Nehru's foreign policy and Chinese aggression in Tibet. In 1952 session of *Jana Sangh*, Deendayalji said, "Our foreign policy must not be tied to any power group and it must try to secure maximum number of friends among nations of the world. *Bharat* is naturally opposed to dictatorship anywhere and so it must side with democracy and freedom. Bharat's natural sympathy should be with nations that have become recently free from the stranglehold of colonial imperialism, *Bharat* must work for peace but it must do nothing that will bring dishonour or damage to peace-loving nations."

In the light of this resolution, Deendayalji marched ahead. When this resolution was passed at Kanpur session, Deendayalji had already taken the charge as General Secretary of *Jana Sangh*. Resolution of 1953 session at Delhi took serious note of China's aggressive intents: "China has established its hegemony over Tibet, has caused Bharat's embassy in Sinki-yang to close down and has started attacking *Hindu* pilgrims to Kailash and Manasarovar. *Bharat* should strongly protest against these things to China and compel China to reopen Bharat's embassy in Sinkiyang." This resolution drew the people's attention to Nehru's anti-national foreign policy and there was a country-wide criticism of the policy.

For the first two decades after independence, Nehru dominated

Indian politics. Defence depends on our weaponry, ammunition and people's morale, but it also depends on our foreign policy. To keep the enemy away from our boundaries, we need to have buffer states. Burma, Nepal, Tibet, Sri Lanka and even Pakistan must serve as buffer states. The first Bajirao Peshwa has demonstrated that often attack is the best defence. Nehru thought otherwise. He said in 1951 in Parliament, "An honourable Member has said that like Bismark, we must assume our borders to lie far out in Africa, Burma and Malaya........Such policies of Bismark are now obsolete. If we follow this policy, so will the other nations and the result will be war." Many events in the world had already blown up Nehru's ideas but he came to realise his mistake only after China attacked us in 1962 and we were most unprepared for such an eventuality. Korean and Vietnam wars had commenced, Tibet had been run over by China, Russia had used brute force to put down nationalist risings in Poland and Hungary, Israel was surviving against a siege of Arabian sworn enemies only on account of its military power and determination. Nehru thought that war will ruin all human civilization and so war must be avoided at all costs. China gobbled up several thousand square miles of Indian Territory and Pakistan swallowed up one third of Kashmir. In spite of all this, Nehru's fever of 'NO WAR' raged unabated; he raved, "Negotiations, Negotiations and Negotiations to the bitter end."

## Defence Preparedness - An Eternal Need

Nehru and Communists used to malign *Jana Sangh* as obscurantist and war-monger. Deendayalji never cared a tuppence for this slander and continued to insist on being defence-prepared. He was against joining any power block and against any neglect of our defence. He knew that the whole country will have to be prepared for war, if the Chinese armies were to be driven out of our land. And so he was a protagonist of a pragmatic foreign policy which discerned between our country's real friends and foes - the aim of the policy always being defence. Certain groups, who were politically opposed to Nehru, began a tirade against Nehru's foreign policy and expressed themselves in favour of India joining the Western i.e. American block. It would have perhaps paid *Jana Sangh* temporarily to voice the feelings of these groups. But Deendayalji said, "There are people who always ascribe the aggression against a country to the failure of its foreign policy; they are over-estimating the importance of foreign policy. Our Government put its faith in Panchsheel and military force remained neglected. Those that advise India's joining the Western block are making the same mistake by failing to emphasize war-preparedness. Lord Chatfield was the Admiral of the British Navy during the Second World War; see what he says in the article entitled 'Defence of the Empire'. He says, "There is a tendency to over-emphasize importance of foreign policy as contributory to defence. After the First World War, there have been mutual peace-pacts all over the world and many thought that in view of these pacts defence-preparedness may be neglected. Fact is, we must always be adequately prepared. Foreign policy decisions have often to be taken on the spur of the moment but it is impossible to take such quick decisions in the matter of defence, for the simple reason that striking force takes a long time to develop. Therefore defence schemes have to be planned along time in advance."

While foreign policy influences defence capability, the above discussion shows the former's limitations. After the First World War, there were several peace pacts; but power group politics outdid the peace pacts which took the form of military help-pacts like NATO and Warsaw. Weapons and ammunitions stockpiled and powerful large nations began to use small nations as their military camps, leading to armed skirmishes. In order to avoid these confrontations from developing into a conflagration or a full scale war, hot telephone lines came to be established among leaders of power blocks. How far the hot line was useful was shown by the Cuba incident. Nehru knew this and had an idea of our military power limitations. Nehru appealed to the super powers America, Russia, England and China to solve the Korean problem peacefully. While the world hungered for peace, it seems to be forcibly drawn to destruction by war. He assured all co-operation, on behalf of India, to do its all to help world-peace-efforts. To do this without joining one of the power blocks, Nehru wanted to write to all nations for peace, to send Indian soldiers to join UNO's peace force, to counter NATO and Warsaw pacts by Panchsheel pacts, to create a third block of neutral nations. But Nehru was not willing to do anything substantial to root out Chinese and Paki aggressions. He admitted need for defence improvement. But he used as excuses the food dependence on foreign countries, lack of public morale, absence of military roads near the border and miserable state of country's industrialisation. These are excuses because he never did anything to close these loopholes. Vis-a-vis China, the Communists wanted a weak India; the Socialists craved for India weak in relation to Pakistan.

Deendayalji and *Jana Sangh* went on constantly pointing out to the nation, Chinese danger but the eyes of the people and Nehru opened only when China actually attacked India in 1962. Till 1962, the socialist progressives also ridiculed *Jana Sangh*'s support to Dalai Lama. Savarkar was ridiculed as a British Recruitment officer when he advised young Hindus to join the army etc. during the Second World War. The same people dubbed Deendayalji as a war-monger. But Deendayalji, undeterred by misleading slogans or temptation of being carried away by cheap popularity, always pressed for defence-preparedness. After Chinese aggression *Jana Sangh* demanded nuclear weapons for the forces. Deendayalji frequently warned the people and the government for ten years (1952 to 1962) against possible Chinese aggression but it all went unheeded till actual Chinese attack in 1962. Then America helped India but Russia declined help saying, 'blood is thicker than water' (meaning that as Communist country, China was Russia's brother). Deendayalji predicted, in less than 3 months that, that not only some Asian nations but even some Communist nations will stand up' against China's expansionist policies and will be supporting' *Bharat*. Very soon the relations between China and Russia began to deteriorate. The main issue was defence. Savarkar's principle that 'enemy's enemy can be our friend' is very important in foreign policy. It naturally follows that there are no permanent friends or enemies in international affairs. Deendayalji said, "If democratic West and Communist Russia can join hands to defeat Germany, what is surprising if some Communist nations, when their national defence is jeopardized, oppose China?"

## The Brave Deserves Kingdom of the Earth

Certain convictions of Nehru stood in the way of Hindusthan's defence-preparedness. Bismark's idea that from the defence point of view, a nation's boundaries should be considered as extending far beyond the area of actual control, he considered as not applicable to the modern world. He believed that Muslim and other aggressions could be successfully countered by lecturing on peace and that all international disputes could be settled by negotiations. Deendayalji wanted to puncture and deflate this balloon of Nehru's misconceptions and he achieved this with powerful arguments and propaganda. Later on, Nehru began to adopt Menon's pro-Communist policy and Deendayalji openly demanded ouster of Menon. From Hungary to Cuba, Nehru's thoughts were partisan (i.e. communistic) and against the policy of neutral nations. Deendayalji planned and led a number of agitations in opposition to this attitude of Nehru. In July 1960, Deendayalji demanded, "The Communist minded Defence Minister Menon is unfit to checkmate Chinese aggression. Government should not read too much into people's tolerance. Menon should be expelled forthwith." Menon's loyalty to *Bharat* was suspect and all parties, except *Jana Sangh*, tried to whitewash this fact by trying to project him as a progressive. With a War Minister like Menon, the outcome of the war was writing on the wall. The reason why Deendayalji considered Menon as the greatest hindrance in Bharat's defence was, what was obvious from the latter's interview in which Menon had stated, "Indian army, though strong, cannot counteract the Chinese" and "Unless Indian Constitution is amended, India cannot hand over Indian Territory to China or Pakistan. " Both these statements were demoralising and defamatory and such a man could not have continued as a minister even for a minute more in any country. But Nehru saw nothing wrong about it. Deendayalji referred to this abominable state of affairs and asked, "Does it mean Menon merely voices what Nehru thinks. Or does it mean that by his utterances Menon ties down the hands of the Prime Minister?"

Nehru as External Affairs or Foreign Minister and Menon as Defence Minister together weakened and demoralised Indian defence. To his policies, destructive to Indian national interest, Nehru gave a whitewashing of a sham philosophy. But Deendayalji's philosophy was based on real patriotism and so instead of beating about the bush by digressing on world peace and development of the third world, he would talk directly about Indian defence. The lexicographer Dr. Johnson was once asked how many fish must be placed end to end to reach the moon; the learned doctor answered. "Only one would do, if it is long enough" Same can be said about defence. How much expense is necessary for defence? The answer is. 'So much is necessary as will ensure defence of our country'. There is no alternative to defence. Negotiations, Panchsheel, peace lectures, all have proved ineffective. Sophisticated weapons, compulsory military education, orienting people to face any necessary war and breeding an idealism that considers no sacrifice too great for nation's freedom should form the four basic principles to follow. But Nehru was the leader and mentor of a party which respected none of these principles. Under the garb of working for *Hindu*-Muslim unity we strengthened the Muslims who have raped *Hindu* society and religion for thousand years. The Congress made Hindus forget their prowess. The results are that on the day of independence we lost three and three fourth lakhs of square miles of our motherland (as Pakistan) to aggressive Muslims, half of Kashmir was allowed to remain in Pak hands and 35000 square miles were lost to China. In October 1962, China attacked India and almost immediately Nehru broadcasted to the nation a speech bidding farewell to Assam. Just for this single act, Nehru should have been impeached for treachery. But the earlier fifty years of a tradition of servility had bred a mentality which relished in a mock philosophical verbiage in place of a direct discussion of defence factors. *Jana Sangh* was, during this time, growing in strength and making the people defence conscious. In 1965, the then Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri concluded Kachchha pact under British pressure. He was following Nehru's anti-national policy. Deendayalji organised a protest against Kachchha pact and lakhs of *Jana Sangh* supporters flocked to Delhi from different parts of the country to take part in the protest-demonstration.

It may also be noted here that a year earlier (1964) China had exploded its first atom bomb. Within less than a month of *Jana Sangh* protest, war against India was started by Pakistan and for the first time in modern Indian history, Indian army marched into enemy territory. Rashtrapati Radhakrishnan had reminded the nation of the Sanskrit aphorism वीरभोग्या वसुन्धरा.' 'The brave deserves the kingdom of the earth." The national military prowess was being systematically destroyed for past one century; the Kachchha protest checked the down-hill slide. When there was a foreign aggression, Deendayalji withdrew *Jana Sangh* agitations in national interest. He was neither a pacifist at all costs nor a warmonger. All he wanted was war-preparedness. He did not want *Bharat* to tie itself down to any power block for he knew the limitations between defence and foreign policy. He regarded defence as above politics. This is why he doubted Nehru's patriotism for Nehru had said, "While fixing international boundaries, a couple of miles this inside or that side, should be given no importance." Deendayalji was extremely opposed to yielding even a square inch of land and his party roused the masses against such a loss.

* * *

## 5

# *Swadeshi* Economics For People's Good

(*Swadesh* means one's own country. *Swadeshi* may be translated as 'indigenous'. It is preferred to retain the term *Swadeshi*).

There was euphoria in *Bharat* at the beginning of the British rule here. Raja Rammohan Roy breathed a sigh of relief that at long last Hindus were free rock from foreign yoke after a thousand years. There was a general belief that the British introduced us to the world and to science. But gradually the novelty wore off and a consciousness of *Swatva* (one's own or a nation's own inherent nature and culture etc.) began to grow. It is true that post and telegraph facilities and the rapid and the safe railways opened new vistas of communications. But soon, Justice Ranade showed how the country was economically being looted and Congress President Surendranath Banerjee showed statistically how during droughts, unlike other countries, crores of people died from hunger. Swatanryaveer Savarkar burned foreign clothing and Gandhiji pointed out how Indian interests are better served by coarse *Swadeshi* cloth used in preference to foreign fine cloth. So it dawned upon public that *Swarajya* was a must for *Swadeshi*.

After independence, people here expected that foreign capital will be expelled or at least no additional foreign capital will be allowed to flow in. Ours is an agro-economy and so economic plans will emphasise farming. A natural expectation was that the common man will be the centre while preparing plans, budgets, different schemes and the framing of commercial and industrial policies. As the Prime Minister, Nehru was at the helm of national affairs, but he failed the nation. Foreign capital and foreign companies were permitted to flood the country. This foreign onrush was not for any industries basic to our economic planning. Most of the foreign companies busied themselves either in producing consumer goods (which could have been best produced by promoting indigenous enterprises and could have inspired love of *Swadeshi*) or luxury articles like tooth powders, beauty aids, ready-made clothes, footwear's and so on (which we could have either do without, or produce locally with some effort). In 1947, the foreign investment here was 255 crores of rupees and in 20 years it rose to 1611 crores of rupees. Machinery began to replace labour and able bodied men lost their means of subsistence. With each Five Year Plan, unemployment went on jumping up. Piloo Modi had once said, "It will be interesting to figure out how many Five Year Plans will be adequate to make the entire population unemployed."

During the '*Swayamvar*' (the function in ancient *Bharat* in which a young bride would choose a spouse from among several prospective grooms (usually princes) seated in a row in a pendal) of princess Indumati, as she moved (with a garland in her hands) inspecting the princes, it happened that as any particular prince was approached his face lighted up with expectation but as the prince was passed on, his smile disappeared. So Indumati was like a torch-light which successively lighted up and darkened the face of the princes. The poet Kalidas described Indumati as a *deep-shikha* (flame of a lamp). This simile was applicable to our five year plans. To each new Plan, people looked up with hope, the hope changing to frustration as the plan period ran out.

Nehru was the ex-officio Chairman of Planning Commission and as such he had often declared that the aim of planning was to raise the standard of living of common man and that the co-operation of all people and parties in this national effort was welcome. But actually things were far from this and the farmers and workers, who should have benefited from plans, got next to nothing.

## Food Imports Touch an All - Time High

Socialist Party and Shetkari Kamgar Party both were once part and parcel of the Congress. Both these parties were opposed to this destructive economic policy of the Congress. In its 1950 session at Dabhadi, Shetkari Kamgar party analysed the Congress policy thus: "After handing over of power on 15th August 1947 India did not get real independence. The foreign investment in India to the tune of 800 to 900 crores of rupees continues unabated. British monopoly in the important coal, tea, jute industries continues. From 1947 through to 1949, an additional foreign capital of 16.9 crores was permitted in this country. After power transfer, new Anglo-Indian and American-Indian joint companies have been formed here. These companies merely put their stamp on goods imported from the West and sold them as 'made in India'."

By the time Deendayalji arrived on the political scene, it was anybody's guess as to what percentage of Indian national expenditure was spent in the interest of ruling party. Planning was less for the people and more for Congress; the bureaucratic politicians wanted plans to toe the West while the Communists and their fellow travellers wanted plans to suit Russian interests. Nehru always sided either with the bureaucracy or with the Communists depending on his mood but all the while he was talking about the good of the people. It is necessary that the farmer must be enabled to stand on his own, the agricultural production must increase, leading to food adequacy and stability, industry must progress without further increasing unemployment and finally every citizen must be involved in the country's development; this was Deendayalji's view. In our country, the Congress tendency has been to governmentalise everything and to enforce all reforms by enactment of laws. In these circumstances, Deendayalji thought that the only way out of this impasse was to educate the people by enlightening them on various issues. To this end, Deendayalji explained and agitated; he clarified policy differences with Congress and even laid down principles for any national economic plan such as would really benefit the nation. Deendayalji's economic policy is not the subject of either this chapter or this book, but the fact remains that modern politics touches all aspects of life in general and economics in particular; as such this economics must take into account both the immediate and the distant aims and effects in economic planning and execution. In defence and foreign policy, there is a large class which thinks in terms of world power blocks; similarly there are groups which would like to tie down the country's economics to some 'ism'. But economic thinking must not be based on man regarded merely 'as an economic animal' but its natural foundation must consider man's many dimensions-man's various aspirations, social traditions, the times and the circumstances etc. Once, in relation to the cooperative movement, some questions arose and Nehru slighted off the whole thing by saying, "What is so difficult about it? Everybody should take orders from the leader of the movement just as one takes orders from his family head and the leader should use his powers in the interest of all." Deendayalji's comment was, "The example of a family's head is O.K. There, however, is a snag. The family head acts for the good of all in his family but his actions are not intended as a vote-catching device."

The very first five year plan exposed the Congress tendency to augment the economic power of government. *Jana Sangh*'s criticism of the First Plan in its 1952 session was: "*Bharat* is mainly an agricultural country. Food and cotton are our staple crops. Their production must be increased in such a way that we would not have to depend on other countries. The plan adopted by Government is based on the American method of farming; imported tractors and diesel are its unavoidable concomitants; thus comes dependence on the West for food and clothing and to that extent our economic independence suffers. Basic needs must be wholely indigenously supplied." In 1951, Nehru as Chairman of the Planning Commission declared his resolve to stop food imports. But like Nehru's other declarations, this proved a hollow slogan and during the next decade there were huge food imports from America, every fifth Indian living on foreign food. First five year plan was of 2000 crores and between August 1956 to May 1960 the amount spent on food imports alone amounted to 1067 crores.

Deendayalji's greatest emphasis was on *Bharat* becoming self-sufficient and self-reliant in the shortest time possible. In the early British Rule there was British 'army aid' and now came American 'food aid', both crippled our country. Ten years back we imported diesel from Russia to run our tube-wells to water our fields in UP and Bihar, but wheat was sent to Russia as a price for diesel; what a logic ! The folly was that there was no attempt in the plan at self-sufficiency. Congress was looking at everything not from the national but from the party interest point of view. Government started an institution named '*Bharat Sevak Samaj*' overtly to devote its whole time attention to country's development but it was at the most a shadow of an institution, with the same name, started 50 years earlier by Gopal Krishna Gokhale; it tendered no service and never even boasted of any sacrifice. Khadi and Village Industries Board were instituted, but it hardly did any service to village economy. The Board became a grazing ground for Congress election workers.

**Gold Control and its Evils**

In modern times there is a trend to concentrate economic as well as political power into the hands of a single party or government. Because of collective farming, State trade organisations and government industries, government itself is becoming goods producer, farmer and trader all-rolled into one'. This state of affairs strikes at the very root of people's independence. In Russia and China, government owns and runs the means of production and the distribution and so the political party there, is the dictator. Deendayalji's objection was to this all-pervasive power of the State or party. Since 1950 it has become fashionable to demand that any private factory or mill, which runs into deficit, should be governmentalised (in the name of nationalisation). But wherever the demand was conceded, government has failed to make it a profitable concern. And Deendayalji has pointedly drawn attention to this failure. All opposition to governmentalisation came to be identified with support to capitalism and capitalism in turn with workers' exploitation; Deendayalji opposed this by pointing out that the governmentalisation, which was being given a misleading name of nationalisation, was in fact nothing but State capitalism which would be disastrous to individual freedom. Deendayalji challenged the government to run public sector industries to become profitable. Nehru often talked of the need for a healthy competition between public and private sectors but such a thing was never to be, for, Nehru gave top priority to Congress interests. Deendayalji doubted if Nehru himself believed in the competition he talked about. Deendayalji pointed out that the private sector was not, by law, allowed to compete with the public sector and it was not that private entrepreneurs could not successfully compete with government factories; fact is that government factories had become monopolistic. Under the name of socialism crores of rupees of the tax payers were left in the hands of second rate technicians and corrupt officers; the aim was not national good but party benefit and favouritism.

Deendayalji's quarrel was with this sacrifice of national interests. He favoured no group and no 'ism'. In politics and economics he had only one criterion of propriety-the furtherance of national interests.

Gold control ordinance was issued soon after Chinese aggression and even before Morarji placed his budget before Lok Sabha. Deendayalji was not opposed to gold control as such. But he felt that the control will defeat government's aim. The international price of gold being lower, smuggling will increase and the country will be the loser. Even granting Morarji's controls were well intentioned. it was feared that the trading in gold will be under the counter and black money with government officials will rise. Deendayalji's predictions came true, for, gold which was selling at Rs. 85/-per 10 grams rose to ten times within a small period and now it has reached a height of Rs. 3,500/- per 10 grams. The country was losing very heavily due to lack of proper economic perspective and due to the practice of patchwork solutions to economic problems.

## Declaration of PL 480

Deendayalji used to emphasise that independence must get manifested in all walks of our life. As such there must be indigenous technique in all matters (or if technology is imported it must be modified to suit our requirements and circumstances here) and all schemes must be indigenously oriented. Foreign loans, foreign companies and imported weapons and ammunitions must be made minimum use of and that also for a short transitional period. Indian capital must always be given priority over foreign capital. Work must be provided to each hand and everybody must be placed above want, and thus made free to work for his '*purusharthas*'. The notion of man as an economic animal was born in the 19th century and had become current in the 20th century. This notion must be replaced by recognising the fact that man is an organic whole consisting of mind, intellect and soul in addition to body.

Farm land and the farmer are the foundation of our economic development and so there must be provided water to each farm and work to every hand. Thus thought Deendayalji. But as time passed it became clear that Bharat's foreign dependence is increasing all the time PL 480 was a contract with America which was signed in 1956 for importing grain from America and in 1960 it was decided to make huge grain imports. Indian Ministers went out to America for the grain and on their return the beggars were given a rousing reception befitting war heroes. Deendayalji reacted by saying, "We shall welcome S.K. Patil, the Food Minister, then and then only if he proves himself to be the last beggar Ambassador on behalf of *Bharat*." The atmosphere was charged with gratitude for American 'aid' (i.e. sale) and Nehru's praise for this 'success' of his foreign policy. Mr. Elsworth Bunker, the American Ambassador in *Bharat*, had claimed, "This grain supply will stabilise India's internal economy and politics and help India's progress." Deendayalji blasted the claim by saying, "We are grateful that America has helped us in tiding over our difficulty. But it is even truer that America stabilised its own farming by finding, for the next few years, an assured market for its farm-produce. American agro-produce-exports up to 1959 were to 38 countries and amounted to 1,978 crores rupees PL 480 which stands for Public Law 480 was passed by the American Congress in 1954 mainly with the aim of providing stability to their agriculture industry. America was also selling wheat to Russia. And the American aid to India was nothing more than a commercial transaction between needy customer and a producer."

Out of the imported 170 lakh tons of grains, the government was going to use a part for creating a buffer stock hoping thereby to reduce prices and check inflation. There was nothing wrong with this as to stop-gap arrangement. But a long-term policy should be to help increase indigenous production of grain and with thrift to build up a buffer stock. The average Indian's income is so low that most of it goes to buy food. 70% of the population depends on farms and sale of farm-produce and if the prices fall too low, these 70% people will suffer severe loss of their purchase-power. Our policy must not thus help American farmers at the cost of Indian farmers.

## Industries - Foreign Preponderance

*Jana Sangh*'s opposition to communism was misconceived as its love for America. Many could not even think of *Jana Sangh*'s patriotism which did not tie it down to either a power block or to an 'ism'. Deendayalji saw securing power as inevitable, but as a means to an end and not as an end in itself; and this is why his *Jana Sangh* contested all elections (from Gram Panchayat to Lok Sabha) with enthusiasm and ever increasing success. But if power has no ideal of national good, it becomes a hindrance to the national progress. Examples abound even in modern history, from American Nixon to Japan's Tanaka and Egypt's Najib (who all tumbled down in their life time).

Shri Shri Prakasha(an ex-minister in the Centre and Governor of Maharashtra) and Nehru were old chums and had a heart to heart talk just two days before latter's death. They recalled their dreams during independence-struggle and were deeply grieved at how independence came but the dreams were smashed. Nehru was continuously in power for 17 years. Whence then came this failure?

The reason was superficial thinking. What did we want freedom for? Certainly not for replacing Edward by Aurangzeb. But our leaders' thinking never conceived the importance of *swa* (indigenous - rooted in our culture) in *Swarajya*, otherwise to expell John Bull there would not have been committed the folly of readiness to welcome the Amir of Afghanistan and we would not have welcomed foreign capital and companies on such a vast scale (from America, Germany, Japan etc.) and impoverished India.

Deendayalji's ideas were clear. He wanted *Jana Sangh* to be in power, neither for party's sake nor for nepotism but for country's good. He made it known that socialism was merely a name for State-capitalism as it only offered to provide bread for all but at the cost of all citizens' rights. He was committed to country's good and its defence, but neither to any power blocks nor to any 'ism'. This is why he could see beyond his party's interest and work for the country; an example of this is that the agitation for halving land revenue, which while in full steam, was suddenly withdrawn by him when China attacked India in 1962.

### Not Dogmatic but Pragmatic

The decade that followed independence saw governmentalisation of industries and farming cooperatives. Traders were looked upon as exploiting middle men. The people and the government had faith only in state trading corporations. Communists and other leftists supported governmentalisation in the name of 'nationalisation'. Any opposition to 'nationalisation' was dubbed as support to capitalism and to profiteering traders; such opposition was termed rightism and declared as people's enemy. *Jana Sangh* was opposed to such 'nationalisation' which only concentrated economic power in the hands of the ruling party. *Jana Sangh* was condemned by all so called progressive parties as obscurantist. But the story of Rajasthan briefly summed up here will be an eye-opener.

After the first general elections, in Rajasthan Legislative Assembly, in a house of 160 members, the non-Congress parties had a total of 77 (including 8 of *Jana Sangh*) and they formed a front called Samyukta Vidhayak Dal. Lalsingh, a *Jana Sangh* member, was elected Deputy Speaker of the house. *Jana Sangh* demanded that the ownership of land must be that of the tiller (September 1953). *Jana Sangh* gave a call to its legislators to quit the Samyukta Vidhayak Dal which, in the interest of Jamindars, had opposed the bill supporting *Jana Sangh*'s demand. Lalsingh defied the party whip and retained his Deputy Speaker-ship; four other *Jana Sangh* men also defied the whip. Deendayalji, as the General Secretary of *Jana Sangh*, expelled those five MLAs from the party. *Jana Sangh* then had, in the whole of India, just 35 legislators and so it was a heavy price (of losing 5 legislators) *Jana Sangh* paid for its principled politics. Among those that stuck to the party policy was Bhairaun Singh Shekhawat and it is another story that 25 years later Shekhawat became Rajasthan's Chief Minister and under his leadership the Janata government planned and executed Antyodaya Scheme (to help the lowest of the low) which was praised by all.

Deendayalji was the General Secretary of an All India party and he was also a great thinker. His political thinking could be compared to that of Lokmanya Tilak, Swatantryaveer Savarkar and Mahatma Gandhi. Whenever they were forced to choose between national interest and party interests, only one, they always gave priority to national interest. Their ideas, of what was of national interest, did differ. Only under exceptional circumstances, national interest was set aside as in Tilak's advocacy of Lucknow pact and Gandhi's acceptance of partition of *Bharat*; but they did it, not out of any self-interest, but out of the force of circumstances. These men were utterly unselfish. The British had confiscated Savarkar's lands and house. When some people raised their voice against continuation of the confiscation even after independence, he said, "I never did anything with a selfish motive. Most of the *Bharat* is free today; is it not a great gain for me?" Savarkar defied death. He defied personal power too.

Deendayalji used to say, "Paucity (*abhav*) of wealth is bad, but so is the dominance (*prabhav*) of wealth. Similarly he thought of power. Without power you can't do good, but there is no greater evil than power abused. He wrote off five *Jana Sangh* legislators in Rajasthan in the wider national interest; equally easily he joined hands with Dr. Lohia to put forward the idea of a Federation of *Bharat* and Pakistan. Some people thought that this was retrogression from the idea of Undivided *Bharat*. But Deendayalji thought otherwise: did not the idea of Pakistan develop by degrees? Then the ending of division of India also must be nurtured in the people's mind by degrees. The joint communique advocating federation, however, raised a storm among the socialists who became suspicious of Lohia tending to become a communalist.

Deendayalji's commitment was neither to power nor to a dogma. He was not dogmatic in the sense that he refused to stick up to a dogma, if this dogma were definitely contrary to facts of life. This is to say, he believed in principles which tallied with experience. Paraphrased, he was pragmatic. Hence, when questioned as to what was his 'ism' he would reply, "Mine is *Yatharthavad*." *Yatharthavad* may be translated as a theory or principle which is consistent with actual experience, i.e. Realism.

**Collective Cooperative Farming**

To the question of choice between Collective Farming and Co-operative Farming, private or public industries and private or state trading, the answers given by politicians from Nehru to Ashoka Mehta and Rajaji to Namboodripad were stock dogmatic answers. But Deendayalji would check the answers on the criterion of national good and not on any 'ism'. Slogans and public speeches were abounding in support of co-operative farming which alone, it was argued, could end Zamindari. Deendayalji declared, very much against the popular upsurge, that cooperative farming would soon be a pasture for the bureaucracy. Nehru and the leftists raised a row against *Jana Sangh*, maligning it as anti-nationalisationist, anti-cooperative farming and obscurantist) Deendayalji was not at all against co-operation. But he thought that the co-operative farming had certain inherent limitations:

"In a *Hindu* undivided family also farming depends on co-operation; in the family, people come together not only out of profit motive, but out of the feeling 'from each according to his strength and to each according to his need'. Whether it is co-operative farming or any other co-operative scheme, since government exercises an overall control, the ruling party will use it in the interest of its workers and voters." The experience in Kerala is a pointer in this direction. In Kerala, communists came to power in 1959; they used power to get control of non-communist cooperatives and new societies were registered only if they were communist ones. The Congress party and its protagonists wailed against this in its All India Committee. In the meeting, P. Govinda Menon further pointed out how non-communist co-operatives had their registrations cancelled and how the Registrar would order that his friends (communists) be made members. The Congress was doing the same thing elsewhere where they were in power. Deendayalji opposed collective farming for the reason that it was communistic in conception i.e. materialistic and against human nature. It had been tried in Russia and it had failed. Secondly, the farmer lost all his interest and initiative and was reduced to a paid labourer. A further reason was that for collective farming to be viable, it has to be done on a large scale which necessitates use of machines which in their turn will produce large unemployment.

In a *Jana Sangh* Workers' meeting, a worker asked, "Today we oppose collective farming. If we get power tomorrow, what harm is there in accepting collective farming?" Deendayalji replied, "Will it not be governmentalisation if done by our Party?" Power is to be used for country's good and not for party's good." Government should not be the trader. If a private trader loses, he declares himself insolvent and the matter ends there. But if government loses, it makes up the loss by extra taxation. If government itself becomes a trader, then who will check undue profiteering? But, as an example, see what government does as a trader MP government, as monopolist, purchased wheat from the farmer at the rate of Rs. 13/- per maund and sold it to Central government at Rs. 19/-. The Central government sold it back to MP government at Rs. 22/- and the MP people got it back at Rs. 24/-! This is exorbitant as compared to a private trader. Governments fear no competition. It is ruled out by enactments.

Deendayalji has said, "As a socialist, J.P. Narayan should have supported government as a trader. But he did not. He has said, "In grain trading, the traders have the accumulated wisdom of generations. Government does not have their expertise..." But unfortunately both government and the people outside government would not give up their ego and could not take a pragmatic view."

Socialism had become the current coin. The government was rapidly 'nationalising' things. In this 'nationalisation' people's co-operation was nil. It was actually 'governmentalisation' or better still 'bureaucratisation' (against which Tilak protested so often). The bureaucracy, barring a few exceptions, was full of mediocre and selfish people. As in other countries, 'nationalisation' resulted into corruption, bureaucracy and the Congress working hand in hand. It was corruption which was nationalised. Fortunately Deendayalji was extremely watchful. A keen observer and a thinker, he could see clearly the corruption and spared no pains to warn the people against the all-pervasive power of Nehru and his designs. This he could do, as he was aware of both opportunities and temptations of power and as he always looked to power as a means to nation's good and not an end in itself.

* * *

## 6

# Muslims - A Complex Problem

After independence many important problems had to be faced by the government, the political parties and the people. Of these, we have so far considered language, economy, defence and Chinese aggression. But the Muslim problem is the oldest, the most complicated and it assumes ever-new forms. This problem has been facing us for the last twelve hundred years. If two societies happen to stay together in a country for hundreds of years, they are naturally expected to become one. But this did not happen here. Even in other countries where Muslims were aggressors and conquerers, they maintained their separate identity and forcefully Islamised the conquered people. In Islamisation, Muslims carried Quran in one hand and sword in the other hand. Here, in Punjab, Rajputana, Assam, Maharashtra, Karnataka and Kerala, Muslims were seriously opposed and indigenous identity was retained. The Muslims ruled here for 650 years.

In the course of time, Delhi came to be dominated by Hindus though formally the king there was Muslim. After winning the war at Plassy, the British gradually extended their rule over the whole of India. Agitation against the British commenced here from the 1857 war of Independence. It is true that Bahadurshah, the Emperor of Delhi, participated in this war but soon the Muslim leaders recognised that it was not in the interest of the Muslims to oppose the British. Secondly, during the earlier one thousand years, the Muslims had not identified themselves with the Hindus. The 650 years of slavery to Muslim rulers had resulted in a loss of self-confidence of Hindus who then felt that to successfully fight the British, co-operation of the Muslims is a must. (This gave rise to territorial nationalism). But Muslims reacted differently. Sayed Ahmed Khan was the chief Muslim mentor at that time. He started the Mohammedan-Anglo-Oriental College and this paved the way for establishment of Aligarh Muslim University. Sayed Ahmed Khan was knighted by the British in 1888 and Sir Sayed systematically worked to keep the Muslims away from opposing the British. The then Muslim leaders viz Nizam of Hyderabad, 'Salarjang', Munir Ul Mulk, Fateh Nawab Jang and Sayed Hussain Bilgrami joined Sayed Ahmed Khan. The Congress was formed in 1885. To oppose Congress, United Patriotic Association was formed in 1888. Later in 1893, an organisation called Mohamedan-Anglo-Oriental Defence Association was formed and it was open only to Muslims and the English.

### Muslim Trojan Horse

A few Muslims had joined the Congress. The third Congress Session at Madras (1887) was presided over by Badruddin Tayyabji. Sir Sayed Ahmed Khan wrote to Badruddin Tayyabji, "You presided over the Congress Session at Madras. This may have pleased the Hindus but Muslims are definitely unhappy about it. I fail to understand the phrase 'National Congress'. Do you think it possible that the various religious communities in India constitute a 'single nation or will ever be able to do so, or that they can ever have common aspirations? I consider this an impossibility." These thoughts of Sir Sayed Ahmed Khan may be considered the seed of future Pakistan. The reply sent by Badruddin Tayyabji is also significant. The reply was, "Your objection is that Congress regards Hindustan as one nation. So far as I am aware, there is none who supposes Hindustan to be one nation. In my inaugural speech at Madras Congress Session I have said, "In Hindustan there are many communities or nations and every one of them has its own problems. But there are some problems common to all of them and the Congress has been formed to tackle such problems." In these circumstances, I do not feel that Muslims should stay away from Congress. We cannot check the growth of Congress but we can influence it in our favour. My policy is to further Muslim interests not by keeping out of Congress but by working from within it. I appeal to all Muslims to co-operate with Hindus in whatever suits them but oppose with all their might any scheme, brought forward by Hindus, if it runs counter to Muslims interests." This correspondence will bring out clearly the fact that if any Muslim joined the Congress, it was not so much to strengthen the struggle for independence as to serve best the Muslim community.

In 1888, that is within one year of his becoming Congress President, Tayyaji wrote to Mr. Hume, General Secretary of the Congress, "Taking into account the increasing Muslim opposition to Congress, Congress should be kept in suspended animation for at least five years. Congress ideal is Unity among all communities Nizam Salarjang, Munir Ul Mulk, Fateh Nawab Jang, Sayed Hussain Bilgrami and other prominent Muslim leaders have joined hands with Sir Sayed Ahmed. Thus the entire Muslim community is against the Congress and in these circumstances Congress movement cannot be a national movement." He had also declared that any movement in which Muslims do not join is not a national movement. This has been the Muslims' attitude during the next 60 years of Congress movement for independence. The Congress had a double task: to organise the people for the freedom struggle and to persuade the Muslims to join the struggle.

*Hindu* leaders took a practical view and attached importance to *Hindu*-Muslim unity, in view of their ideal of independence. But Tilak sponsored a tit for tat policy in relation to Muslims and stood firmly in support of Hindus in Muslim riots. He said, "I am glad that Hindus are once again openly worshipping their deity Ganesh and that they are putting into practice the underlying meaning of the Bhagwad Geeta dictum '*Swadharme Nidhanam Shreyah*, *Paradharmo Bhayavahah*' (better to die for one's own *Dharma*; it is dangerous to submit to others' religion)." He also said, "Hindus have shown great tolerance in the past. But thus far and no further. Now end this policy." But the moderate leaders Justice Mahadev Ranade, Gopal Krishna Gokhale and Frozshah Mehta opposed Tilak's policy, though it was the just one; the moderate leaders were willing to pay a price for *Hindu*-Muslim unity in the hope that such unity may be possible and may help the independence struggle.

Being caught in the holocaust of the first World War, the British were badly in need of Indian co-operation and hence declared their intention to give further political rights to India. Tilak, after return from Mandalay, apparently softened his attitude towards Muslims and he took the lead in concluding Lucknow Pact hoping thereby to present a joint *Hindu*-Muslim set of demands to the British. Gandhiji's emphasis was, however, more on *Hindu*-Muslim Unity rather than on the unity as a stratagem in the independence struggle. The Muslim appeasement ultimately led to the division of the country.

After the division of the country in 1947, the area that came to be called *Bharat* was larger than the maximum area under direct *Hindu* control at any time during the past 1000 years. Once Pakistan was born as a separate state for Muslims, it was really natural to regard the rest of India as Hindusthan. But Gandhi and Nehru never accepted this obvious idea. Jinnah had argued that India is really two nations, one *Hindu* and another Muslim and insisted on a separate nation (Pakistan) for Muslims. This is the two nation theory. Congress at first opposed this two nation theory but ultimately gave in the face of Muslim violence (as evidenced by their 'direct action' in Bengal). Savarkar, in his presidential speech in the first *Hindu Mahasabha* session, stated clearly that at least psychologically there did exist two such nations. Even after division of India on a religious basis,' Gandhi and Nehru wanted the rest of India not to be an Hindusthan but a composite or secular' India. RSS shared Savarkar's faith of an Undivided India but was striving for an organised invincible strength of Hindus to achieve this goal.

India was partitioned in 1947 and for the first time in 1200 years of Muslim aggression, Hindus acquiesced in a sovereign Muslim state (Pakistan). But this acceptance was not an absolute historical truth. During Akbar's reign, most of the Hindus were vanquished and had accepted Akbar's hegemony, but even in those very difficult times, Rana Pratap challenged Akbar's over-all power and kept alive the nation of 'Hindusthan'. Inspite of Aurangzeb's formidable power and religious fanaticism, Shivaji fought for 'Hindusthan' and initiated the beginning of the end of Muslim power. At the time of partition of India, Deendayalji was Sah-Prant Pracharak in UP (Liaqat Ali and Khalikuzzaman also were from UP) and had closely observed the political, social and psychological conditions. Four years after partition, *Jana Sangh* was formed and Deendayalji was made General Secretary of *Jana Sangh* for UP. The next year (1952) Dr. Mookherji nominated him as All-*Bharat* General Secretary of *Jana Sangh*. The foregoing is intended to introduce the reader to the country's condition when Deendayalji became the mentor of *Jana Sangh*.

On 23rd June 1953 Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji died, in very suspicious circumstances, in Kashmir, while he was in Sheikh Abdulla's jail. After him, on Deendayalji's shoulders fell the idealistic and organisational responsibility of *Jana Sangh*. Among the problems he had to face was the one of Muslims. There was a qualitative difference between the Muslim problem and the other problems. The Muslim problem could not be tackled independently because there was now a separate independent state for the earlier rioting Muslims and most of those Muslims continued to live in *Bharat*. In the 1945 elections in Undivided India, about 95% Muslims had voted for Muslim League i.e. for Pakistan. But even after partition, nearly half of these votaries of Pakistan remained in India; they were ideologically with Pakistan and only physically with Hindusthan. In 1947 a representation of Mopla Muslims met Jinnah who advised the former to remain in India and try to create an independent Moplistan, thus showing the way to Muslims at other places in India.

In line with this policy of Indian Muslims, Kasim Rizvi raised his ugly head in Hyderabad (Deccan). He tried to make Hyderabad State independent of India. Hyderabad had 85% Hindus and only 15% Muslims. Only 10 years earlier Savarkar had led a non-violent struggle against injustice to Hindus. The Rizvi violence against Hindus was instigated by the Nizam. But instead of teaching the Nizam a lesson, the Indian Prime Minister Nehru wasted a lot of precious time in persuasions and negotiations. After a whole year having thus lost, the Home Minister Patel took up the question from Nehru and solved the problem by police action in a short while. Earlier, when immediately after partition, Pakistan attacked Kashmir and the Pak army reached the gates of Kashmir, Hari Singh, the Maharaja of Kashmir requested Delhi for immediate military help. Nehru delayed action till the Maharaja accepted Nehru's two preconditions. Of course, one was to fully amalgamate Kashmir with India but the second was to hand over all his power forthwith to Sheikh Abdullah. Then was sent Indian army, late but not too late. The army was continuing its victorious march but suddenly before the Pak army was completely pushed out from Kashmir, Nehru, out of his unfounded faith in the UNO, halted the army and placed the Kashmir issue in UNO's hands. What happened then is recent history. It is above 40 years now and one third Kashmir still remains in Pak hands. A large chunk was given away and made into a sovereign Muslim state, but Muslim problem remained. The votaries of Pak are here and, are busy in anti-*Bharat* activities.

The solution to this problem had to be logical, practical and understandable to the common man. Till 1947, Hindus tolerated Muslim violence as a price for independence. In 1947, Pak was militarily defeated though the victory was left incomplete. But the Pakistan mentality of Muslims in India remained undefeated. The main reason for this failure was the emotional attachment of Gandhi and Nehru to Muslims. At the time of Partition Hindusthan was supposed to pay Rs. 55 crores to Pakistan and Gandhi went on a fast insisting on this payment while Pakistan, was indulged in aggressive mischievous against *Bharat*. Lakhs of Hindus in Pakistan had their landed and other properties either forcibly seized by Muslims or confiscated by Pak government and the Hindus had to flee Pak to save their lives. The dealing with Pak should have been on a tit for tat basis but Indian government behaved with Pakistan with fraternal love! Unfortunately Gandhi was murdered and the opportunity was exploited by the Congress to condemn *Hindu* leaders as murderers. Savarkar was imprisoned and was placed in the witness box. RSS was banned and *Hindu Mahasabha* was practically reduced to a non-entity. The overall result was that attention was diverted from Muslim separatism.

## Dr. Mookherji Against Muslim Appeasement

Protest against the Congress policy of Muslim appeasement started with Dr. Mookhcrji's resignation from the Central Ministry. In the first Central cabinet Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji and Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar were included. And many supposed that Nehru, the democrat, had risen above party considerations and had included Dr. Mookherji and Dr. Ambedkar in his cabinet. But the fact was otherwise. In a letter to Mahavir Tyagi, Nehru had said, "The earlier cabinets were formed as per Vallabhbhai Patel's advice and so some persons outside the Congress were taken up." Towards the close of 1949, the Muslims of East Pakistan made life impossible for the Hindus there. As per the agreement at the time of partition, it was Pak Government's duty to give full protection to the Hindus. But Pak government never cared to honour its word. As an eye-wash Nehru negotiated a pact with Pak Prime Minister Liaqat Ali Khan. The pact gave no relief to Hindus. Against this failure of Nehru government. Dr. Mookherji strongly protested and resigned from the cabinet. The ban on RSS had been lifted by that time. By the end of 1949 *Hindu Mahasabha* session was held at Calcutta; it was inaugurated by Savarkar and a lakh of people attended the session. The dark clouds of the last two years had been dispelled and *Hindu* awareness was rekindling. Those who had so far been thinking that creation of Pakistan had solved the Muslim problem were disillusioned. The reason for the disillusion was the Muslim violence here as well as in Pakistan.

In such circumstances, the political party *Jana Sangh* was instituted under the leadership of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji and with the support of the countrywide organisation of RSS. In the first session of *Jana Sangh* held at Delhi, Dr. Mookherji, in his presidential speech, declared the ideals and policy of the party. It will be relevant here to consider this speech in relation to the subject of Pakistan and Muslims. Referring to the unity of *Bharat* nation and its communal and national problems he said, "With its ideal of secularism, Congress is continuing its policy of Muslim appeasement and as a consequence Nehru feels especially happy to insult the Hindus emotions. Every citizen can be loyal to *Bharat* whatever his faith-*Hindu* or Muslim. Everybody here irrespective of whether he is a *Hindu* or Muslim or a Sikh, Christian or Bouddha, must be proud of our ancient and great tradition and hence the establishment here of '*Dharma rajya*' is *Jana Sangh*'s ideal. We are hereby resolving to inspire into our people the twin bonds of equality and fraternity and lead our people in the light of *Bharatiya* culture and traditions.

"The recognition of minorities on the basis of caste or sect is wrought with great evils. It is the duty of the majority community to assure all citizens; truly loyal to this nation, that they will get all protection according to law and that they will be treated with equality in social, economic and political fields. *Jana Sangh* is herewith giving this solemn assurance in unequivocal terms."

Then while discussing Kashmir issue he said, "Nehru charges us with communalism. Even a cursory glance at our ideals and policies will convince any sensible man that this charge is totally false. Actually it is Congress and particularly Nehru, who are communal. Nehru and Congress should introspect their actions during the last 30 years. Whenever they were faced with Muslim threats and hooliganism, they fled the field and yielded to the partition of the motherland. Nehru did not stop at sacrificing *Bharatiya* interests before Muslim communalism, but even after partition he has been succumbing to Pakistan threats. Nehru has thus been always pliant to Muslims and Pakistan and so it does not become him to charge us with communalism. He has been appeasing Muslims just to get their votes in elections. This is rank communalism...

"It is our conviction that creation of Pakistan was a terrible blunder. Partition brought us no benefits and failed to solve any of our economic, political or communal problems. The Pakistan promise, to protect Hindus, has not at all been kept as is obvious from the plight of the Hindus there. We believe only in undivided *Bharat*. So long as Pakistan exists, our policy in dealing with it must be tit for tat. The Congress policy of appeasement of Pakistan is a severe threat to the honour of *Bharat*. This pliant attitude of Indian government has made Pakistan so arrogant."

The somewhat long quotation above (from Dr. Mookherji's speech) is intended to clarify the force and logic behind *Jana Sangh*'s opposition to Congress policy vis-a-vis Pakistan and Muslims. An analysis of the speech brings out the following points: (1) This country has a single culture. Though the people have a variety of sect (or methods of worship), they are all heir to this common culture. *Jana Sangh* has no belief in the 'composite' culture (of Muslims and Hindus), of which Congress has been speaking all these years. (2) This new party is not agreeable to the partition of India and it has an unshakable faith in undivided India. (3) So long as Pakistan exists, our policy towards it must be reciprocal or 'tit for tat'. (4) *Jana Sangh* does not recognise any political minority such as Muslims. But it considers the duty of the majority community to treat all loyal citizens with equality and to give them all legal protection. (5) *Jana Sangh* repudiates bending knees before Muslims or appeasing them to secure their votes. *Jana Sangh* policy as regards Muslims and Pakistan was distinctly different from that of Congress, Communist, Socialist, Praja Socialist, Ganatantra, Jharkhand, Shetkari Kamgar, Dravid Kazagam, Forward Block etc. parties. The policy eschewed appeasement of Muslims but *Jana Sangh*'s doors were open to the nationalist Muslims who agreed with its ideals and policies. There would be no compromise on Kashmir issue - Kashmir has to be fully amalgamated with the rest of *Bharat*. In the very first session it projected its distinct identity as a party by declaring that while

Pakistan exists, it should be recognised and our policy towards it should be reciprocal; but it should be our ideal and policy that Pakistan should be ended and an undivided *Bharat* be established. The four year old political and ideological vacuum which followed independence was thus fulfilled up by Dr. Mookherji's speech.

**Deendayalji Accepts the Challenge**

Even while Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji was alive, Deendayalji had become very important to *Jana Sangh*. In May 1952 he explained these basic principles to be followed by *Jana Sangh* in his clear and logical style. Thus he said, "Undivided *Bharat* is not a Utopian idea, but a carefully thought out ideal. Some people consider partition of India a settled fact. This view is totally wrong; the view is only an indication of a lack of intense love for the motherland. These people have forgotten history and have never properly understood its implications. The country was divided into many parts during Muslim domination but our *Hindu* leaders never accepted that as a settled fact and continued to fight against it.

"The second principle of *Jana Sangh* is that there is only one nation in this country. There is no minority in this nation. The human body has one nose and two eyes, but on that account we do not talk of eyes as the majority and nose as minority. The reason is simple; both the eyes and the nose are organic components of the same body.

"The third principle is that there exists only one culture here. There are no separate cultures here for Muslims and Christians. Culture is not related to mode of worship or sect; it is related to the country. Kabir, Jayasi and Rasakhan should serve as models for Muslims. Today their centre of loyalty is outside *Bharat*. The Muslims must completely change their sentiment and view."

In this statement and explanation by Deendayalji there is no vagueness anywhere.

During the early days of Congress, Muslims preached that any organisation which contains no Muslims cannot be called national and that Muslims should not join Congress. Later, even though

Muslims had not changed a bit, Lokmanya Tilak concluded Lucknow Pact admitting thereby the indispensability of Muslim co-operation for independence. Instead of convincing Indian Muslims' of their grave error in being loyal to the Khilafat and instead of teaching them to take pride in their ancestral Indian traditions, Gandhi supported Khilafat restoration movement of the middle East. In those times, the sole criterion of Indian patriotism was conceding every Muslim demand. In place of making Muslims chant the line त्वं हि दुर्गा दशप्रहरण धारिणी (You are Durga, who carries ten weapons) in the national anthem Vande Mataram, the portion was simply deleted at the cost of nationalist *Hindu* sentiments. From Deendayalji's quotation above it will be seen that he started a process exactly opposite to that adopted by the Congress. Savarkar's slogan began with the words, If you come, then with your co-operation.......'; Deendayalji also invited Muslims to co-operate but the co-operation, he sought, was on the basis of true nationalism. His stand was clear but logical, insistent but persuasive, determined but controlled. This stand was the reason why during his 16 years in *Jana Sangh*, never even once did he seek to bring Muslims into *Jana Sangh* by compromising on programmes, or by appeasement.

In attempting a solution of the Muslim problem he had to deal with government, Muslims and Hindus, He was at once the practical politician, theoretician, patriot and the leader of a party which must capture power. To understand his politics one must see how he acted in the various day-today events.

The exodus of Hindus from East Pakistan was a permanent problem. Congress never took it seriously and other parties simply connived at it. *Jana Sangh* was different. The founder of *Jana Sangh* had resigned from the Central ministry on this question. The question of *Hindu* refugees from East Pakistan was becoming serious every 3 or 4 years. In 1958 this exodus was very large and Pak military crossed Bengal and Assam borders into India and forcibly occupied many villages and towns. As usual, Nehru halted Indian army and started negotiations with Pak Prime Minister Feroz Khan Noon and concluded Nehru-Noon pact. According to this pact Nehru handed over a part Berubari of West Bengal to Pakistan; the population of Berubari was 10,000. Deendayalji raised a hue and cry against this treacherous pact. West Bengal Assembly unanimously protested against this. The Supreme Court declared the pact anti-Constitutional. Deendayalji said, "None will accept steps taken against the country's sovereignty. The steps ruin the future of a large Indian populace. While Pakistan has neither agreed to Indian rights nor settled boundary disputes, Indian government has handed over to Pakistan a territory forcibly occupied by Pakistan. Not only this, but Indian government has also given to Pakistan the territory which the Indian army had defended and saved at a great cost.

"Knowing fully well that no Hindus life, property or honour is safe in Pakistan, it is very strange that Nehru is forcing thousands of Hindus to go into Pakistan. This pact of Nehru is flagrantly unconstitutional. None - not even Lok Sabha - has the right to give away part of India to Pakistan or to any other government."

Deendayalji issued this statement and soon started a countrywide agitation on the Berubari question, drove the President to refer the question to the Supreme Court which in turn declared the pact anti-Constitutional and forbade the government from handing over Berubari to Pakistan. But Nehru defied the Supreme Court also and amended the Constitution to enable him to give Berubari to Pakistan!

## Truly National Stand

Nehru was submissive to Pakistan and also appeasing Indian Muslims to enable him and his party to remain in power. In Kerala, Communists came to power and immediately Nehru began his strategy to unseat them. To this end, Nehru joined hands with Muslim League. Deendayalji severely criticised this restoration of the League to its political status and pointed out the treacherous politics of Nehru. Deendayalji appealed to the Congress leaders not to resurrect the Muslim League which was responsible for the country's partition. Nehru tried to whitewash his action by saying that the Muslim League in Kerala was different. But Sayed Abdul Rahaman Thangal, the President of Kerala Muslim League, immediately issued a statement declaring, "Kerala Muslim League is not an independent organisation but it is a branch of the All India Muslim League." Muslim League was re-establishing itself in Indian politics and Congress was once again wagging its tail before the League. But there was a qualitative difference between the period before the independence and the period after the independence.

Prior to Independence, Gandhi used to argue that the pliancy towards Muslims was a price for independence and thus persuaded Hindus to acquiesce in his actions. But in the post-independence period Nehru could not use the ruse. It was plain that the post-independence Muslim appeasement was unashamedly for retention of power. Muslim League was also conscious of its bargaining power. Deendayalji's analysis of the growing Muslim League threat is indicative of his watchfulness in the national matters. In the beginning of 1961, Muslims raped a college-student *Hindu* girl; on finding that the police were shielding the culprits the Hindus were wild with rage and the local Muslims were taught a lesson. But at the same time Muslims in Virur took out a march shouting '*Pakistan Zindabad*' and '*Hanske Liya Pakistan*, *Ladke Lainge Hindustan*' (the latter meaning 'We have taken Pakistan in our stride and we shall take the rest of Hindustan by war). Muslims held a meeting and wailed that the Muslims in India were in great danger. At this Nehru became very uneasy and in the Congress Parliamentary Committee proposed that in order to create a feeling of security among the Muslims it was necessary to recruit more Muslims in the police forces. About these events Deendayalji wrote, "The Muslim gathering has clearly brought out the communalism which pervades Muslim community. In a way this is welcome, as, many were under the wrong impression that the poisonous-atmosphere produced here by the League had cleared after partition. Staunch Leaguers were declared nationalists the moment they entered Congress. But a mere change of cap does not change the hearts of men. The cap can be changed as a political strategy. The recent events have shown that the cult of the old Muslim League has not disappeared from this land. The times being favourable the cult is again raising its ugly head and the Congress, the Socialists and Communists are vying with each other to bargain for narrow political party interests. Political parties condemned Congress for joining hands with the League in Kerala, but it is recent history how these same parties watered Muslim communalism on the questions of the cow and Urdu. The earlier Muslim League has now in many places attached Communist Party labels. Even the Praja Socialist Party has reaped political advantage in the last elections by collaborating with the Muslim League in the matter of 'dog incident' and the 'question of books'. Muslim League has supported different Parties. In Lucknow, League supported P.S.P's Triloki Singh but in Varanasi, League was working for the Communist candidate Rustam Satin against Sampoor-nananda. In Moradabad, League worked for an independent candidate of its own choice against a Congress Muslim candidate. League supported a Communist candidate in Bhopal for the Assembly, but a Congress candidate for Lok Sabha. Everywhere the League's choice was made differently. That is why the various parties competed with each other to get League support and so League had the audacity to be overtly communal." This quotation from Deendayalji will clearly show the background of his analysis of the complex Muslim problem. He held a press conference in 1962 in Bombay while declaring the list of *Jana Sangh* candidates for the elections. *Jana Sangh* was open to all Bharatiyas and yet it was fashionable to condemn it as communal simply because of its purely national stance. A press reporter asked, "How many Muslim candidates is *Jana Sangh* fielding?" Deendayalji replied, "I do not know. While choosing candidates we do not take into account their caste religion or such other connections. We choose individuals who have faith in *Jana Sangh* ideals and policies and who are also otherwise suitable." This reminds us of a reply given 10 years earlier by Dr. Mookherji, the founder of *Jana Sangh*, to the press question, "Why is it that Muslims are admitted to *Jana Sangh*." The reply was, "We feel that hereafter politics in India must eschew the term

Muslim minority. *Jana Sangh* is open to all, but none desirous of entering it can set any pre-conditions; any entrants to *Jana Sangh* must wholly accept its purely-national thinking, its progressive economic programmes and its pride in *Bharatiya* traditions. *Jana Sangh* will not alter its just and national policy for wooing anybody." It may be mentioned here that undivided *Bharat*, a single culture and a single country and people were the central ideas in *Jana Sangh*'s thinking. And anybody who accepts these three national principles could be regarded as a real *Bharatiya*.

## Lohia Became Convinced

Deendayalji was picking his way through the communa-listic political muddle of Indian parties. But it is a travesty of circumstances that he and his party were charged with communalism. But with his unusual intelligence, organisational skill and patriotism he started a rethinking in several parties which found it hard to refute his hard logic. Leaders like Dr. Lohia, who had the capacity to look beyond their party, saw much sense in what Deendayalji said. In April 1964, Deendayalji and Lohia issued a joint statement:

"As a result of extensive disturbances in East Pakistan, more than 2 lakhs Hindus and other minorities have been forced to migrate to *Bharat*. In *Bharat*, there is severe anger about the events in East Bengal and it has expressed itself in some parts. In order to solve this problem, it has become necessary to carefully analyse the situation, but while doing this we should not forget our *Bharatiya* life-values.

"We definitely feel that it is a duty of the *Bharat* government to protect and get protected the lives and properties of Hindus and other minorities in Pakistan. To shirk this responsibility by giving the false excuse that they are Pakistan citizens is an invitation to genocide in both the countries. Whenever *Bharat* government fails to protect minorities in Pakistan, it is but natural that the people here should be enraged. We appeal to the people here to direct their rage, not to the Muslims here, but to the government. Directing the rage towards Muslims gives the government here an opportunity to cover up their inaction (in protecting Pakistan Hindus) by repressing the people.

"We feel that the life and property of Muslims in India must be protected just like those of other Indians. Any government which cannot protect the right to live of its own citizens or the citizens who cannot share this right with their neighbours are nothing short of barbarous. It is our holy tradition to protect the freedom of all sects.

"We believe that the division of our country into India and Pakistan is absolutely artificial. The reason for their bad relations is the wrong attitude of both. The two governments, instead of thinking of just one problem at a time, should jointly consider all problems and circumstances together. This would result in a far better mutual understanding and may initiate the process of forming a federation of the two countries."

The statement that showed that even leaders outside *Jana Sangh* can be persuaded to scrap the idea of Pakistan as a settled fact. Nobody had ever suggested that Pakistani violence against Hindus there should be retaliated by violence against Muslims here. It was necessary and possible to protect the Hindus etc. in East Pakistan only by attempts on the governmental level. To this end Deendayalji placed before the country a programme to educate the people and pressurise the government. This programme started the process which ended seven-and-half years later in the freedom movement and independence of Bangladesh.

The statement was issued in April. But Deendayalji had not forgotten that it was the Muslims, living happy lives here that had supported the demand for Pakistan. Muslims of Kashmir valley were being instigated to join Pakistan and it is true that these Kashmiri Muslims felt drawn to Pakistan as a Muslim state. Within a month of issuing the statement referred to above, Deendayalji strongly warned the Muslims here: "It is extremely immoral and also dangerous to raise the Kashmir issue in any form and to break away from the assurance given so far that Kashmir is inseparable from *Bharat*. Such an act will endanger the life and honour of the 13 lakhs of

Hindus in Jammu-Kashmir. "There is nothing we have left undone to help the 14 lakhs of Muslims of Kaṣhmir valley; but after all this if these Muslims do not want to stay in *Bharat*, then *Bharat* will have to rethink about its policy towards the Indian Muslims because 90% of these Muslims had supported the demand for Pakistan in 1946." *Jana Sangh* central working committee passed, on 25-6-1964 a resolution which expressed this thought.

This will point out that Deendayalji's thoughts are absolutely clear. He is well aware of the historical Muslim attitude. But at the same time, he is optimistic about the future because he was certain that Hindus will become strong and today's government which appeases Pakistan will be changed. According to him, the best solution of Muslim problem consists in defeating Pakistan on the battle-field and Muslims in Indian politics. No outsider needs to mediate or meddle in the matter of Indian Muslims for the question is entirely ours. In 1956, he said in a public meeting, at Vadodara, "Recently there has been rioting on the pretext of the book 'Religious Leaders'. Muslims may have objections to certain portions of the book. But instead of complaining about it to the President of *Bharat*, they chose to complain to the King of Saudi Arabia and shouted slogans 'Death to Hindustan'. When later Nehru visited Saudi Arabia, why should the King there have enquired of him about Indian Muslims? And why did Nehru reply that they were happy and well protected in place of saying, as would have become the Prime Minister of sovereign *Bharat*, that the happiness and protection of *Bharatiya* Muslims is entirely our internal question? Congress wants to buy Muslim votes by appeasing them at all levels - internal or international. But *Jana Sangh* wants to nationalise Muslims." Deendayalji wanted Muslim co-operation in national matters but he was against Lucknow-pact. He wanted Muslims to stop killing cows but for it he would not want *Bharat* to support the foreign Khilafat movement. (While justifying his support to Khilafat movement, Gandhiji had said that thereby he hoped to save the cow). Deendayalji would like Muslims to join *Jana Sangh* but for this he would not bargain with Muslim League. He would not refuse election tickets to such Muslims as were really patriotic *Jana Sangh* workers committed to Undivided *Bharat*.

## East Pakistan and Assam

Deendayalji knew fully well how all earlier attempts at *Hindu*-Muslim unity had wrecked on the rock of Muslim communalism and anti-national attitude. The Assam question had been growing worse during the past fifty years and now it had become very serious. In 1940 there was Nizamuddin (Muslim League) government in Bengal and in Assam there was Mohammed Sadulla's government. The Second World War was ranging. Using the 'Grow More Food' campaign as an excuse, thousands of Muslim farmers were being sent to Assam. This was a secret plan of Nizamuddin and Sadulla for increasing the Muslim population in Assam. The increase in Muslim population clearly reflected in the census of 1941. On this, the then Viceroy of India, Lord Wavel, had said, "This grow more food campaign is nothing but grow more Muslims campaign." Since then Pakistani Muslims were planning to grab Assam whenever Pakistan would materialise. At the time of partition Assam remained in *Bharat* due to the efforts of Dr. Shyama prasad Mookherji and Gopinath Bardolai, the Congress Chief Minister there. But due to the enmity between Bengali Hindus and Assami Hindus, Sylhet district of Assam went to Pakistan. After Partition, Muslim infiltration into Assam became greater still. Muslims do no family planning and the East Pakistan served as a simple outlet for its extra Muslim population by pushing them into Assam and the Congress and other parties welcomed them as it strengthened their vote bank. Assami Muslims, with the help of new Muslim arrivals, managed to inflame the enmity between the Bengali speaking Hindus and Assamiya speaking Hindus who foolishly fought and killed each other. In these circumstances, it was only RSS workers who properly assessed the situation and spared no pains to help the Hindus (both Bengali and Assami) who had suffered in the *Hindu-Hindu* rioting. RSS also did their best to educate the two *Hindu* language groups to sink their differences in view of the danger in the near future. In August I960. Deendayalji toured Assam and tried to awaken the self-quarrelling Hindus to reality. About what he saw in his tour he wrote very frankly, calling a spade a spade, "During the riots in Assam, the Muslims, not only from Assam but also from Bengal and UP, played an abominable part; they looted and burnt *Hindu* houses and even temples and Muths. Ramakrishna Mission at Dibrugarh was attacked and the idols of Durga, Ganesh and Kali at Nowgaon were broken. In many places cows were burnt alive. The Muslims did all they could, to make Assam a Muslim majority province.

"It is necessary to find out all those responsible for the riots and they must be given deterrent punishments. But it is very doubtful if the present ministry would care to do this. It is true that some persons have been arrested. But there are many complaints against the arrests of innocent persons. It is quite possible that government, in attempting a show of action, may connive at many culprits going scot-free while many an innocent persons may be scapegoat. Therefore, in the interest of justice, it is imperative to change the present government."

The above quotation is a part of a report, on his Assam tour, written by Deendayalji and entitled 'What I saw in Assam'. To make Kashmir, Assam, Mallapuram, Malegaon, Bhivandi, Moradabad, Hyderabad, Veraval and other places, Muslim majority places and weaken *Hindu* India from within has been a League plot; of these Kashmir is already having a Muslim majority. Any party which listens to even the right case of Hindus is condemned as communal by Congress, Communists and Socialists. Deendayalji never sacrificed whatever he considered truly national, out of fear of being dubbed communal and always called a spade a spade. *Jana Sangh*'s resolution on Assam in this period says, "Driving out Hindus from East Pakistan and Pakistan Muslim infiltration in Assam, West Bengal and Tripura are two parts of a single plot. Since the partition, excesses are being committed there against the Hindus. Recently there has been a spurt in this heinous activity and there is a large scale loss of life and property. Hindus in Pakistan are being looted and dishonoured so that the *Bharat* government may not drive out Pakistan infiltrators in Assam. "In place of taking firm action against all this, *Bharat* government is neglecting its duty of driving out the infiltrators. The protection of life, property and honour of Hindus in East Pakistan and driving out infiltrators in India are two independent issues and both must be firmly and effectively dealt with. "*Jana Sangh* demands of the *Bharat* Government that the Pakistani Muslim infiltrators in Assam, Tripura and West Bengal should be driven out and the necessary steps be taken to prevent such infiltration in future. *Jana Sangh* further demands that the *Hindu* refugees coming from East Bengal should be given asylum by government and it should demand from Pakistan compensation for their losses and also land for their rehabilitation; also arrangements be made for their safe transport to *Bharat*."

In this resolution there is no equivocation as the terms Hindus and Muslims are used and there is no vagueness in the ways suggested. There is no bitterness against Muslims but also no love for the traitors and infiltrators.

◆

## 7

# Pakistan - A Challenge

The Muslim problem was two fold, one, of Muslims in *Bharat*, the other in the form of Pakistan. In the case of Muslim rioters in *Bharat* it was possible to use article 144, to use preventive detention act and lodge criminal cases against them. These means were of no avail against Pakistan where a further complication was Nehru's international policy. When Kasim Rizvi made life difficult for Hyderabad Hindus, Sardar Patel resorted to 'police action'. Such measures were not possible against Pakistan. In Kashmir, even before all Kashmir was freed from Pak army, Nehru ordered cease-fire according to his notions of international peace. *Bharatiya* independence, unity, well-being, progress and cultured life had been eclipsed by the rioting Muslims within the country and by a war-mongering Pakistan. This will show the magnitude of the Muslim challenge facing Deendayalji. His politics was directed to tackle this problem.

The Muslim question had been there not just for a hundred but a thousand years. During the British regime it became a political issue and after partition and after universal adult suffrage the Muslim block vote became a bargaining power for Muslims and the Muslim vote, purchased at the cost of national interests, became a sustaining force for Congress and other like minded parties. Deendayalji's three principles in the solution of this problem were : (1) creation of undivided *Bharat*, (2) so long as Pakistan exists, a reciprocal policy towards it, (3) the nationalisation of Muslims in this country after their defeat as a political force inside *Bharat*.

These three principles were different from the politics of any other party or individual. It was necessary to understand the practicability of these principles because Deendayalji had to see that *Jana Sangh* is organised, that it grows and that it gets power. His politics and nation-building would be tested on these. Just as it was not wise to spoil future by fighting historical feuds in the present, it was also not wise to darken the future by forgetting lessons taught by history and by avoiding repetition of past mistakes. On this twin principle, Deendayalji sought out a way for the national good While remaining watchful about the present, without forgetting the past and for getting a grip on the future, Deendayalji guided *Jana Sangh* by the three principles. His political thinking can be understood by studying how he acted and reacted on different occasions, in his 16 year career as the mentor of *Jana Sangh*.

**Pakistan is Foreign Rule**

Nehru-Liaqat Ali pact made it quite obvious to Dr. Mookherji the need for a new party. Later Nehru clandestinely offered to give away to Pakistan the Indian territory of so called Azad Kashmir beyond the cease-fire line. Later on by Nehru-Noon pact Nehru gave away Berubari to Pakistan and still later Prime Minister Shastri had offered to give away Kanjarkot to Pakistan. In the canal water dispute and Farakka dam dispute, Pakistan could make *Bharat* accept unjust agreements because of the weak-kneed policy of Congress towards Muslims and Pakistan. On every one of these occasions, Deendayalji educated and organised public opinion and opposed the government. Deendayalji did this for 14 years. In his 1965 speech at Pune, he discussed all these questions. This was a time when *Bharat* government was about to execute Kachchha pact. Pak was in a warring mood and many Muslims in *Bharat* were rejoicing at Pakistani threat of attack. *Jana Sangh* was making preparations for a massive demonstration against Kachchha Pact. On this background Deendayalji made his historic speech. He said, "How can independence and foreign rule co-exist? These two things are contradictory. Shivaji Maharaj established a sovereign swarajya and his ambition was to free the whole *Bharat* on the strength of that Swarajya and by following the same policies and methods. The way we freed Hyderabad and Goa is the way we have to free Pakistan standing on our land; this is our duty and our right. We must not tolerate any foreign power standing on our land. To free Pakistan and amalgamate it with *Bharat* is no aggression as we have every right to take what is and has always been ours.

"Some talk of such an attempt as an aggression. But fact is that the very existence of Pakistan is an aggression on independent *Bharat*. Some argue that Muslims are our brothers and should not be called foreigners. Arguing the same way, why is Aurangzeb, who lived and utilised the wealth here, regarded a foreign ruler? Are not Moghal kings to be treated as foreigners? If not, Shivaji, who fought against Moghal power, must be regarded a traitor to this country. If Akbar is our man, Rana Pratap, who fought with him, will no more be a patriot. If Rana Pratap, Chhatrapati Shivaji, Chhatrasal, Durgavati are patriots, then those against whom they fought must be regarded as foreigners. Akbar may have been great but he was not ours. We speak of having become free after a thousand years of slavery. This simply means that during Akbar's reign we were in bondage.

"In 1947, Pakistan was created. About this it can be said that of our motherland, which was foreign-dominated from the Moghal times, one part became free but another part was enslaved again. The government of this enslaved part is not being run in the spirit of independent *Bharat*. Muslims claimed a separate identity and nationhood and demanded a separate state. Muslims came here, sword in hand and so it must not be forgotten that the war with Muslims is not religious but political.

"Our quarrel is not with Mohammed, nor with Mullas and Maulavis. Our quarrel is with the way Muslims behave, coupling political ambition with religious zeal. This is why this war is not religious but political. Chhatrapati Shivaji was fully aware of this and hence he did not pull down mosques but fought with Aurangzeb. Our war today is also for political independence and because Muslims do not join the main stream of *Bharatiya* nationalism."

## What then is the Remedy?

Deendayalji explains, "There is only one way to defeat Muslim bigotry and it is to politically defeat them. That is the real solution of the Muslim problem. So long as they are not politically defeated, the rot will continue to grow. Only such a defeat will make them have second thoughts and the process of *Hindu*-Muslim co-operation will begin. It is a general rule that defeat makes men introspective. So far as Hindus are concerned, their tradition is that of accommodation of any sect. Our policy should be aggressive on the national plane, tolerant on the religious plane and accommodative on the social plane."

No thoughtful, sensible man, even if he is an opponent, can term this policy as communal, narrow minded or belligerent ; and yet this is how Deendayalji's policy came to be condemned by all those who valued party interests above national interests. All such political parties joined in chorus to malign *Jana Sangh* as per the saying- 'Call a dog mad and kill it.' But Deendayalji did not heed all this declamation; he continued his efforts to educate the masses on the need of political defeat of Muslims, of pressurising the government for a reciprocal policy and of never appeasing Muslims for selfish party-gains.

## The Great Men on Pakistan

It will be instructive to consider Deendayalji's thoughts given above in the perspective of what other contemporary leaders and thinkers have said. Mahatma Gandhi and Nehru were directly involved in with partition. Savarkar was opposed to Partition right from the beginning. Dr. Ambedkar had made an in-depth study of partition and Pakistan. Abul Kalam Azad was a Congress leader and a protagonist of Muslim cause. Justice Chagla was a Muslim but he was not partial towards Muslims. What did these leaders, of different attitudes, feel about Pakistan before and after partition?

Gandhi fought for several years for independence. He rejected

Pakistan idea out of hand. But at the same time he had issued a statement that 'Muslims can have Pakistan if they are keen on it'. When the Congress passed a resolution supporting partition, he agreed to it only as he could see no alternative. He declared, "I am defeated on the *Hindu*-Muslim question." But curiously he went on an indefinite fast so that *Bharat* may pay Rs. 55 crores to Pakistan. Nehru ridiculed the Pakistan idea in the beginning - calling it a 'foolish idea', but later, in his haste to get power, he agreed to Pakistan. He went further after Pakistan was born and declared that Pakistan was a settled fact. He connived at all Pakistani aggressions and ill-treatment of its *Hindu* populace and any thought of action against rioters was subdued by fear of Pakistanis' possible wrath. Savarkar opposed Pakistan idea from the beginning and when he saw that Congress was yielding to the demand, Savarkar remarked, "We do not want to replace an Edward by an Aurangzeb." Savarkar preached that Muslim goondaism must be checkmated at all costs. He also placed an ideal before the people by saying, "Let us consolidate our independence and be committed to undivided *Bharat*." Savarkar laid great emphasis on the nation's militarisation and on a united political front of Hindus.

Let us now see what Dr. Ambedkar thought of Pakistan and Muslims. He felt that Muslims were anti-national. In 1936 he came to the conclusion that *Hindu Dharma* based on Varna and Ashram will not prove beneficial to the 'untouchables' and he openly declared his intention to quit Hinduism. Immediately Christian missionaries and Muslim Maulavis started wooing him to embrace their respective religions. While publicly replying to them Dr. Ambedkar said, "It is necessary to consider the repercussions on the nation due to a change of religion by the untouchables. If they embrace Islam or Christianity, they will become anti-national. If they become Muslims, Muslim population will double and so Muslim influence will increase. In case they become Christians, Christian population will become 5 to 6 crores and the British stranglehold on this country will be tighter still. But if they become Bouddha, the future of India will not be endangered and they will not be anti-national. Hence if at all untouchables must change religion, they may become Bouddha," Thus Dr. Ambedkar has clearly said that anybody becoming a Muslim or a Christian, becomes anti-national. There is great similarity between what Dr. Ambedkar has said and Savarkar's equation: 'Change of religion is change of nationality'. Dr. Ambedkar has pointed out another aspect of this question in his piquant style.

Jinnah wanted a separate state for Muslims. But how could all Muslims in *Bharat* go into Pakistan? Dr. Ambedkar asked, what will happen to Muslims where (in *Bharat*) they will be a minority if Pakistan is created? He says, "Because of the separate Muslim state the rest of *Bharat* will be Hindustan and a *Hindu* state and then how will Muslims here be protected? Muslims in *Bharat* will be ruled over by Hindus and will this not be bad for Muslims? The Muslim League politics started for safeguarding Muslim interests and it culminated in creating a separate state for them."

Dr. Ambedkar clearly analysed Leagues politics and predicted that the residual *Bharat* will be a *Hindu Rajya*. It is another story that due to *Hindu* culture, Muslims here also were going to be well protected but not as a minority. In March 1940, League passed a resolution demanding Pakistan. In his book 'Thoughts on Pakistan' (published in 1940), Dr. Ambedkar says:

"It will be better if Muslims, whose loyalty to *Bharat* is suspicious, go out of *Bharat* and continue their enmity than if they remain here with enmity in their hearts……It must be admitted that Muslims are a different nation………If you agree to Pakistan you will be free from the fear of aggression and enslavement by each other. India should be divided into Hindustan and Pakistan. When on the high seas, a ship is in danger of capsizing, it is usual, as a last measure, to throw over-board whatever load is not indispensable. So, if partition is not done, the consequences may be terrible. Forced but deceptive unity will mar all progress and independence will be a hollow dream. Insistence on undivided India will result in frustration, for; it will have no single identity." Dr. Ambedkar's thoughts are clear and free from ambivalence. Muslims are anti-national and will never be one with

Hindus; give them a separate state and let the rest of India be a pure *Hindu* state so that it can progress - this is the substance of what he has said. After Pakistan comes into being, Dr. Ambedkar does not think that the Muslims, still living here, will remain loyal to *Bharat.* As a remedy for this he suggests, "To avoid civil war, Turkistan, Greece and Bulgaria exchanged populations on a religious basis. Similarly Hindus from Pakistan and Muslims from *Bharat* must be exchanged. This is an infallible remedy for peace and for creation of a homogeneous state."

Dr. Ambedkar's thoughts were based on the situation in the country at that time as also on a deep study of Muslim attitude. There was, however, a fly in the ointment; he had admitted Muslim sovereignty over at least a part of the country. But this is explicable. For five hundred years from Mohammed Ghory to Aurangzeb, most of *Bharat* was under Muslim rule. All that Dr. Ambedkar did is to admit Muslim rule in a region to which Hindus have consecuted and while describing this fact he does not bring in any such things as self-determination, secularism, *Hindu*-Muslim fraternity etc. He also insists that not a single Muslim be left in Hindusthan.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad has been praised as a nationalist Muslim. During the six years of World War II, he was continuously the Congress President. He was opposed to partition because he considered it against Muslim interests. Let us consider what Dr. Ambedkar says while highlighting Azad's attitude and activities. He says, "The demand for separate Sindh (this demand was granted by the Constitution Act 1935) is communal. This is a plot to convert Muslim majority in five provinces into Muslim political majority which is very dangerous." In his speech at Calcutta, in a Muslim League meeting. Azad had said. "Hindus have (majority in) 9 provinces; this separation (of Sindh) will make possible 5 Muslim (majority) provinces. So the Muslims will be able to deal with Hindus in these provinces in the way Hindus treat Muslims in their 9 provinces. This will be a great benefit flowing from this (separation of Sindh). Muslims will have thus added a new weapon to their armory." This quotation will expose the real Azad behind the facade of a 'nationalist'.

In his autobiography, written ten years after partition, Azad says, "Congress and Muslim League had both agreed on partition. Since Congress represented the whole country and most Muslims supported the League, it was proper to think that the whole country had agreed to partition. But fact was far different. The atmosphere in the country, both before and after the partition, shows that consent to the partition was only in Congress resolution and in Muslim League papers. The Indian masses were opposed to partition. Even inside the League there was a large group opposed to partition and they were deeply pained when it was decided to partition the country. Hindus and Sikhs were opposed. The scheme was accepted by the Congress but even afterwards, opposition to it remained undiminished.

"After partition the League leaders, left behind in *Bharat*, had become ridiculous for as Jinnah left for Karachi (after partition) his message to Muslims in *Bharat* was to remain loyal to *Bharat* government. This spread disillusionment and a sense of weakness in them.

"They had never imagined these consequences. After creation of a Pakistan in Muslim majority provinces, it was obvious that the remaining provinces, which had *Hindu* majority, would become Hindustan.......They had been given to understand that Muslims in *Bharat* will enjoy the rights of citizens of a foreign sovereign nation (Pakistan)."

Justice Chhagla, once a leader of Muslim League, was a man of intellectual independence. The moment Jinnah started moving in the direction of Pakistan, Chhagla left the League for he could not bear the idea of partition. Though he was a Muslim by religion, he thought of himself as a traditional *Hindu* and he looked upon Shivaji as a national hero. In his autobiography he writes about partition, "I have always felt that prior to partition, the feelings of Muslim masses had never been ascertained in any democratic way. The Congress had no right to assume that the Muslim masses concurred in whatever Jinnah was saying and doing. A referendum should have been taken in the whole of *Bharat* on the issue of partition.

"My complaint is that not only the Congress but even Mahatma Gandhi cared very little for really nationalist Muslims. They attached greater importance to Jinnah and his followers. Publicly they praised us but actually they neglected us. I am sure that had they backed us, then we would have shown Jinnah's inconsistencies and could have dissuaded Muslims from Pakistan idea to nationalism before it was too late."

## Defeat the Muslims Politically

The politics of Gandhi, Nehru and Azad resulted in partition. Jinnah could not get all the territory he wanted and so he called his domain as truncated Pakistan. Savarkar could not inhibit formation of Pakistan but he looked forward to reuniting *Bharat.* Chhagla was sorry at what happened but among Muslims very few were sober like him.

On 14th August 1947, when Pakistan came into being, the then Congress President Acharya Kripalani wailed, "This is an evil and unhappy day for Hindustan."

Partition was not agreeable to many and it was not justifiable by any logic. *Jana Sangh* was instituted 4 years after partition. At that time, the partition wound was oozing in the form of exodus of *Hindu* refugees, thousands of *Hindu* women and girls had been abducted, East Pakistani Muslims were infiltrating into Assam, Pakistan had attacked Kashmir and Nehru had permitted a large chunk of Kashmir to remain under Pak control. The separatist Muslims in *Bharat* were raising their head again and were readying to measure their bargaining power in the coming elections.

It is necessary on this background to examine Deendayalji's thoughts, principles, policy and programmes. He used to say that Muslims must be defeated politically, because Congress had attached undue importance to Jinnah and the Muslim League and had given disproportionate representation to Muslims resulting in a grant of veto to them. This is why Deendayalji suggested the destruction of Muslim political separatism, refusing any compromise on national issues and nationalising them. He tried from time to time to explain this to Hindus and Muslims and everywhere from Assam to Kerala, he opposed Muslim separatism in practice and theory. All this time Congress, Socialists and Communists were resurrecting League for votes. In 1962, there was to be an election for the Mayor ship of Lucknow and the Congress, PSP and Communist Party joined hands to support Muslim League candidate in return for League support in a few places elsewhere. But Deendayalji did not fall a prey to the temptation and proceeded with his nationalist policies. He neither ever gave *Jana Sangh* ticket to anybody because he was a Muslim nor refused a ticket simply for his being a Muslim. He wanted to defeat Muslims politically which meant defeating Muslim League, defeating candidates who would toe Muslim line and also political parties which in place of nationalising Muslims were themselves succumbing to Muslim Communalism. In politics he built up an image of *Jana Sangh* as a party which followed strictly nationalist policies in economic, social and theoretical matters.

Nehru ridiculed the idea of undivided *Bharat* by calling it belligerent, retrograde, dictatorial and middle-aged. Deendayalji took him right and left while speaking at a public meeting in 1962. He said, "Nehru sends our army to help avoid division of Congo, but the same Nehru ridicules the idea of Bharat's unification. Before agreeing to Pakistan he used to call Pakistan a foolish idea and now he thinks that united *Bharat* is foolishness. Faiths are born not out of any enactments or somebody's grace; united *Bharat* is a matter of faith for our people." Of course, Deendayalji did not fail to support the faith by incontrovertible logic. Deendayalji asks, "Do not Hindus and Muslims stay together in *Bharat*? Did you not brush aside Dr. Ambedkar's advice, at partition time, to exchange populations? You did it out of your faith that partition did not have communalism as its base and out of your faith in a secular state. If in *Bharat* Hindus and Muslims can stay together then by the same token why cannot peoples of *Bharat* and Pakistan stay together?" Deendayalji felt that our policy towards Pakistan, while it exists, should be reciprocal but he also emphatically said that Pakistan is an aggression on independent *Bharat* and that we have every right to defeat Pakistan and create united *Bharat*. He considered the loyalty of Muslims here as suspect and the remedy lay in politically defeating them. He preached that our policy should be aggressive on the national plane, tolerant on the religious plane and accommodative on the social plane; Shivaji, in this connection, he considered a model to copy. Shivaji had no quarrel with the Islam, it was against Muslim hegemony; Shivaji did not destroy masjids but he fought against Moghal power.

### Remain Loyal to *Bharat*

Alongwith the bigotted pro-Pakistan Muslims in *Bharat*, Pakistan was another challenge to Deendayalji. Prior to independence this problem had a single facet. It was the Muslims here that created Pakistan which was now instigating them in turn. Muslims here were shouting, "We have taken Pakistan in our stride and we shall conquer Hindustan by fight." Ayub Khan was saying, "Once we attack (*Bharat*), our armies will march successfully to Madras." Sovereign Pakistan was a shape taken by Muslim goondaism. Nehru government should have followed a reciprocal policy to Pakistan but it was bending its knees before Pakistan even as it did earlier before Muslim League. Deendayalji was totally opposed to this attitude and he constantly pressed Nehru and later Shastri for tit for tat behaviour with Pakistan. The defeat in China war had partially awakened the country to the inefficiency of 'Panchsheel', though for 10 years Deendayalji had been working to make the people appreciate realities and to stop running after wishful dreams. Just a month after Chinese aggression he said, "We also desire cordial relations with Pakistan. Some think that between *Bharat* and Pak there are some unsettled questions and that these can be solved in the way convenient and honourable to both. I do not think so. The relation between *Bharat* and Pakistan is altogether different from that between any other pair of nations. Muslim League leaders wanted an independent state for themselves and hence they demanded Pakistan. Their stand was that Hindus and Muslims are socially quite different. This is also the stand of Pakistan's rulers today. In these circumstances any 'understanding' between the two countries will only mean Bharat's yielding to Pak demands. This is borne out by Nehru-Liaqat and Nehru-Noon pacts, in both of which *Bharat* has always been the loser.

"If *Bharat*-Pak relations are to improve, our attitude will have to be changed. Differences will have to be set aside and absolute unity will have to be stressed. China is also a potential threat to Pakistan. Pakistan must foresee this and join hands with *Bharat* to checkmate China. It is through joint efforts like this that mutual trust can grow."

But Pakistan was never in such a mood. In fact Pak was planning to attack *Bharat* with Chinese help. This is why, while advocating friendship with Pak, Deendayalji also called for a reciprocal policy with Pak.

Nehru gave away Berubari to Pakistan. Deendayalji got this opposed in the Assemblies, in Parliament, in Supreme Court, among the people and even in Berubari itself. But Nehru and Congress, arrogant though defeated by China, decided to give away Chilahati in addition to Berubari. Resisting all pressure, Deendayalji continued his countrywide propaganda, demanding at the same time the deletion of Article 370 regarding Kashmir. At this time i.e. in April 1964, government released Sheikh Abdullah and withdrew all charges of treachery against him. The greatest affront to the people was that Nehru, who talked of Pakistan as a 'fait accompli', permitted Abdullah to restart his referendum front.

Except Deendayalji and *Jana Sangh*, no all-India party was speaking a word against Abdulla, Plebiscite Front or Pak aggression for they calculated that any such talk would hurt Muslims and they would lose in bargaining for Muslim votes. All these parties neglected national interests for paltry gains in Lok Sabha or Kerala and Bengal Assemblies while Deendayalji stood like a rock using politics only as a means to serve national interests.

About this time, Central Government had started compiling a report on communalism under the leadership of Ajit Prasad Jain. Deendayalji, while reacting to this report said, "*Jana Sangh* has never demanded any discrimination against anybody or favour for anybody. We have never done mean propaganda against anybody. We respect secularism and tolerance, not simply because our Constitution has adopted these principles, but because they are our cultural values and because, without them we will cease to be real Hindus. I am purposely using the word '*Hindu*' here. The word has not merely a religious but a much wider national connotation. Muslims, while remaining Muslims, are still the nationals of *Bharat*. Under Muslim League influence, they had accepted the two-nation theory but they must now abandon it. Yet even now they are falling a prey to Pak instigation and to the two-nation theory. Faith in Islam is a different thing and it is totally wrong to equate faith in Islam with loyalty to Pakistan. It is our duty to explain this to our Muslim brothers. They should be faithful to Islam and loyal to *Bharat*."

Deendayalji was fighting against Muslim separatism from Kashmir through Aligarh to Mallapuram; the attack was two-pronged, political and theoretical. Pakistan attacked *Bharat* in Kachchha. Pak had calculated that it would be possible to execute a pact like Nehru-Liaqat or Nehru-Noon, with Nehru ordering cease fire to Indian army and referring the question to UNO; the cease fire would enable Pak to retain what it had under military control at the cease fire time. But this time the prediction went wrong, because the Chinese war had shown how hollow 'Panchsheel' is and Kashmir had shown what kind of justice UNO does. The patriot in Deendayalji was busy bringing home to the people these lessons of recent history.

### Attack Lahore and Rawalpindi

In April 1965 Pakistani armies spearheaded into Kachchha Ran and having the advantage of an attacker, easily occupied Kanjarkot. *Bharat* government under Lal Bahadur Shastri as Prime Minister continued Nehru's weak-kneed policy towards Pakistan and the British Prime Minister Harold Wilson came forward to advise cease fire to

Shastri in the name of peace. (It may be recalled here that just 9 years earlier Wilson's Britain had bombed Suez-thousands of miles away from England-in protection of Britain's political rights there.) Commenting on this, Deendayalji said, "The British Prime Minister Wilson has suggested 'cease fire', to *Bharat*. Obviously England is conniving at the fact that Pakistan is the aggressor. Britain's advice means that it would not care to distinguish, for its own reasons, between the aggressor and the aggressed.

"If Shastri government accepts Wilson's suggestion, it will be like approaching a tribunal to decide on Hindusthan's sovereignty which really only Bharat's people and its military force are competent to decide. If the *Bharat* government were aware of the strength of *Hindu* populace here, it would not have even talked of giving up fight.

"Really speaking *Bharat* must attack Lahore and Rawalpindi and show the world what stuff *Bharat* is made of. If, even after Pak attacks, *Bharat* does not strike back, the whole world will feel that *Bharat* is weak and coward and so no nation in the world will respect us and stand by us." Shastri did not heed this stern warning of Deendayalji but followed in the foot-steps of Nehru, by ordering a cease fire and by concluding (in London) a Kachchha Pact with Ayub Khan. Immediately *Jana Sangh* repudiated the pact and highlighted how, in concluding the pact, Shastri government had fooled the people and even Lok Sabha. Pakistan had set up military outposts in *Bharatiya* territory. Government had assured the Lok Sabha that no pact will be made before border control is restored to what it was before Pak attack on 25th January ; and later, Shastri government started saying that even as early as 1st January, Pak had set up its outposts in Deeng-Kanjarkot-Surai-20 miles south of the International border.

Deendayalji declared that Shastri government had endangered our national interest and had brought dishonour to our independence by the Kachchha-pact and this crime cannot be forgiven. Earlier, in the pacts with Pakistan, Nehru had concealed many things from the people. By Nehru-Noon pact, Nehru agreed to hand over Berubari and its 10,000 people to Pakistan and Indian people came to know of it only when Noon boasted in the Pak Assembly of his success. In 1955 Nehru, in secret talks with Pak Prime Minister Mohammed Ali, had proposed the handing over to Pakistan the (Kashmir) territory beyond the cease-fire line and Nehru had carefully concealed this from the people. And Lal Bahadur Shastri was following the same treacherous policy. Deendayalji determined to oppose this treachery by organising a massive demonstration to save Kachchha.

## Pakistan is an Agression; Remove it

Lucknow Pact was made in 1916 and the Congress leaders claimed that the pact had united Muslims with Hindus and it had become convenient to place before the British our demand for independence. But later events have disproved this claim; if any thing, the Muslim hatred of Hindus went on increasing during the following 30 years. Jinnah secured Pakistan for Muslims by unleashing unprecedented violence against Hindus as, for example, by 'direct action' in Bengal. Pakistan is thus a sovereign shape of Muslim goondaism. In the pre-independence period the British instigated the Muslims and now any nation, from America to China, could instigate Pakistan against *Bharat*. This made Pakistan more and more belligerent. The Congress government should have realised that Pakistan is an aggression on *Bharat* nation and resolved to remove this aggression. But far from this, the Congress government began meeting Pak demands, conniving at its crimes against *Bharat*. (This was in line with the Muslim appeasement from 1916 to 1947). *Jana Sangh* thought that the proper thing to do would be to finish Pakistan and keep it totally defeated until its destruction takes place. This thinking was the culmination of *Jana Sangh*'s deep love of the motherland, of its confidence in the people's strength, of its faith in the ideal of undivided *Bharat* and of Deendayalji's deep study and analysis of history. A year prior to Kachchha-pact, *Jana Sangh* had taken a review of *Bharat*-Pak relations for 16 years and resolved: "Partition has not solved any problem and Hindus in East Pakistan are on the way of being exterminated. *Bharat* government, in constantly trying to please Pakistan, is harming our national interests. *Jana Sangh* has always considered creation of Pakistan as a big blunder. The events of the last 16 years have opened the eyes of many others outside *Jana Sangh*, to this fact. So it is that *Jana Sangh* once again declares that it should be our goal to undo the partition."

On this historical back-ground of Congress treachery, Kachchha-pact had thrown a challenge to *Jana Sangh* and Deendayalji. From 1916 to 1964 Congress had been showering national disgrace on *Bharatiya* manliness. Not that any dared to cross swords with it but it had not been possible to rouse the masses in adequate proportions. Deendayalji picked up the gauntlet to break the back of Muslim communalism and separatism. He charged the whole country's atmosphere to agitate against Kachchha-pact.

Lakhs of people were moving in the direction of Delhi. It was the first time that there was such a massive (estimated at 5 lakhs) march to Lok Sabha. The previous day was an Independence Day or partition day. That single march destroyed the defeatism and inferiority complex of the past 50 years. It inspired the Indian masses to resolve not to budge in front of any anti-national demands out of cowardice, false philosophy or political temptation. This was the success of the national leadership of Deendayalji and his nationalist politics. At one sweep he threw away the intellectual and psychological burden of Nehru-Liaqat pact, of Nehru-Noon pact, of the blunder that was Kashmir, of the Abdulla attitude which stuck like a leech to the referendum front and of the belligerent Pakistan of our creation. The Muslim problem had brought many an intellectual to their wit's end. Many national leaders had failed to see how Pakistan could be brought to its senses. Many really patriotic souls, out of misunderstood secularism, had become sleepless. Kachchha Morcha expressed, in no uncertain terms, what the people wanted and where lays government's duty. The huge demonstration was to the ruling party like the cosmic vision of Lord Krishna, seen by Arjuna. On 17th August, the day following the demonstration, there was held a meeting of *Jana Sangh* representatives. The resolution adopted describes the success of the demonstration thus: "The immediate effect of the Morcha was the cancellation of a meeting of the Foreign-ministers of *Bharat* and Pakistan, scheduled on the 20th of August."

In less than three weeks of the demonstration, *Bharatiya* army pierced twenty miles into Pakistan and in less than two weeks forced Pakistan to lay down arms. What Deendayalji thought, said and acted was an epoch marking a new period in Indian history since independence. The whole country was thrilled with a new found confidence and manliness.

◆

# 8

# An Alternative to Congress

Every political party is after power. An important question is, 'Power for what'? The great men of the past have answered categorically, 'Power for People's good'. Shri Krishna persuaded Bhim to fight and kill Jarasandh in order to set free 20,800 leading personalities jailed by Jarasandh and Krishna himself fought and killed Narakasur to set free 16,108 young girls abducted by that demon. Shivaji fought the Muslim rulers to free Hindus from Muslim repression- religious, social and economic. Deendayalji entered the political arena for a similar noble cause. For 16 years he organised *Jana Sangh* from grass-roots, carried out agitations on local and national levels, set forth basic ideas and principles and fought elections from Gram panchayat to Lok Sabha with increasing success. In this way, he attained for himself and his party a place of respect in the public mind. He knew that a day would come when his party would be called upon to shoulder administrative responsibility consonant with its public image. The fourth election was due in 1967. In June 1963, i.e. a year after Chinese aggression, *Jana Sangh* central executive, in its meeting at Allahabad, had passed a resolution which appealed to all opposition parties to cooperate on several points of national interest. *Jana Sangh* successfully backed Rammanohar Lohia (at Amroha) and Minoo Masani (at Rajkot) for Lok Sabha seats. Six years earlier. Communists had ousted Congress from power in Kerala. Commenting on this Deendayalji had said, "In Kerala

Communists have come to power. We are happy that the notion 'None can remove Congress from power' has been proved wrong. At the same time we are sorry that the vanquishers of Congress are men who are not loyal to this country and who have no faith in democracy. But as people realise this fact, they will pull down Communists even as they pulled down Congress."

1967 elections were approaching. Deendayalji was getting his party ready for the event. Apart from mere scrutiny of voters' lists and contacting each voter, it was necessary to inspire confidence in the workers that they will attain greater success this time and it was also necessary to give them a clear idea of the objectives. This was also necessary for giving the workers a clear guidance. In the election manifesto Deendayalji says at the beginning itself, "The people of *Bharat* are desirous of starting a new period in our history and the forthcoming elections afford an opportunity for the same. The Congress has been in power for the last twenty years and people have lost their faith in Congress. The Congress has done nothing that becomes people's honour. Fact is that the government has never been able to give expression to people's power. The courage of the people and the sacrifice of our jawans have not been reflected in government policies. The government has neglected the country's basic unity and the emotions and sentiments of the people. In place of a life full of self-reliance, prosperity and honour, the Congress has brought the country to the verge of bankruptcy, political slavery and national dishonour. This throttling of *Swadeshi*, *Swadharma* and *Swatantrya* (*swa*=our or mine, *desh*-country, *dharma* is our cultural value-system and *tantra* is method or technique) will not be tolerated any more. The people will give no power to Congress. A change is a must."

Like a real leader that he was, Deendayalji would plan a leap forward, basing his judgment on a keen observation and analysis of the present. He felt that Congress must be ousted from power and he knew that this was in the offing. He also felt confident that his party would displace Congress. This is reflected in the manifesto.

He says therein, "The people want an alternative party today. Only that can be an alternative party which has a clear-cut philosophy, a firm policy and a definite programme. Such a party must have its roots in our cultural soil, must have a country-wide organisation and a cadre of devoted and disciplined workers. The party must also have practicable solutions to country's problems and must never lose sight of its ideals. *Jana Sangh* has arrived only to meet people's expectations. People have given co-operation to *Jana Sangh* because it has gained their confidence.

"In today's transitional period, full of strife, the people look up to *Jana Sangh* with expectation and *Jana Sangh* is aware of this; it is going to face the elections with a firm resolve to shoulder the trust people have placed in it."

The *Jana Sangh* manifesto shows Deendayalji's self-confidence. The earlier manifestos do not show this urge and this responsibility to form government. A characteristic of Deendayalji was to be restrained and calculated in his speech, but what little he spoke was full of significance. The 1967 manifesto shows his extraordinary ability to see far into the future. The manifesto contains no impracticable promises and no boasts.

Along with this manifesto *Jana Sangh* adopted a resolution on the subject of 'National Democratic Alternative.' This resolution is an excellent example of the effective ways and strategy to defeat Congress. The resolution says, "We must take into account the people's urge to throw out Congress; the possibility depends on the existence of a party which can replace Congress and the election preparedness of *Jana Sangh*. Hence it is felt that all seats should be contested in UP, MP, Hariyana and Himachal Pradesh. Elections should also be contested in those constituencies wherein *Jana Sangh* has been active for the past five years and where it can effectively challenge the party in power.

"In those states where other parties hope to form national democratic governments, *Jana Sangh* will co-operate with them. Similarly, where *Jana Sangh* can form governments, it expects co-operation from other parties."

Three months in advance of the elections, *Jana Sangh* had psychologically prepared itself for forming governments. The declaration of this preparedness was made by Deendayalji in a few but clear-cut words: "We permit local adjustments to avoid internal fights among opposition parties. But there will be no adjustments with Communists who have nothing in common with *Jana Sangh* and who are out to win power by any means whatsoever and use that power later to destroy democracy."

The fourth general election was over. Deendayalji's predictions came true. The Congress lost heavily. Through ballot box was expressed people's disaffection because the Congress had brought, in its 20 years career, national dishonour, abject poverty, corruption and neglect of public welfare. Throughout Asia, democracies were collapsing, military dictators were suppressing the people and democracies in Communist regimes of China and Russia had been buried deep. In such circumstances, Deendayalji's 15 years dream of a democratic revolution had come true.

## *JanaIŚangh* Gains, Congress Loses

The Congress was defeated in 8 states and Delhi. *Jana Sangh* made no election adjustments with any party and yet its increase in seats won was the highest among all opposition parties. In 1962 election, *Jana Sangh* had won 14 seats in Lok Sabha. 116 in the Assemblies and it had polled 63, 70 893 votes. In 1967 the respective figures rose to 35 (L.S.), 268 (Ass.) and 1, 25, 67,918 (votes). In the same period Congress Assembly seats fell from 2246 to 1692. The indication was clear. In 9 states, Congress lost majority and the people showed thereby that they no more wanted Congress. The election also showed people's increasing confidence in *Jana Sangh*.

Deendayalji welcomed the change and decided to honour the voters' decision. In the resolution passed immediately afterwards the voters were congratulated and it was declared that *Jana Sangh* would join the mixed ministries (to be formed) which were inevitable in 7 states, since a single party government was possible only in

Delhi and Tamil Nadu. Clarifying the decision Deendayalji said, "If such (i.e. mixed) governments are not formed, Congress party will be invited to form ministries. And if such ministries do not have adequate support in the Assemblies, President's rule will be inevitable. It will simply mean that we have neglected the public which has rejected Congress. Not only this but people's faith in the possibility of a democratic revolution will be shaken. This will inhibit the evolution of democracy." At the same time the *Jana Sangh* central executive gave a directive: "*Jana Sangh* members should continue in the ministries only so long as they can serve the people effectively according to *Jana Sangh* principles and programmes, all the time the *Jana Sangh* legislature party retaining its independent organisation and sticking to its party constitution."

All India representatives of *Jana Sangh* met in Delhi in April. In this meeting, Deendayalji explained, "*Jana Sangh* will participate in the mixed ministries of the states but in the coming elections it will not form any front with others.

"If *Jana Sangh* had formed a front with others in the last elections it would not have secured today so many seats. Also, had not *Jana Sangh* made adjustments of seats in certain constituencies, the Congress would have won many more seats.

"At the same time had not *Jana Sangh* co-operated with mixed ministries (and in fact taken a lead), the Congress would have come to power...... Though the ideals and policies of Communists are quite different from ours, it has become necessary that we come together in these ministries."

During the discussion some representatives demanded that just as no front was formed with other parties for electioneering, so also there should be no participation in mixed ministries. But Deendayalji pointed out the important difference between the two - with a common front, *Jana Sangh* had much to lose. In a Samvid (multi-party government) the basis is only a common programme and we can keep Congress away from power. This is a transitional but important gain.

From this time it became a practice to speak of a popular vote as positive (indicating who should rule) or negative (indicating who should not rule). Deendayalji said about these ministries, "We shall try our level best that these ministries will survive for their normal term, but it is also possible that they may be short lived (when he said this, the ministries were hardly a month old). This is why we must not remain satisfied with our achievement but must be alert and active. Other parties have only a negative ideal of reducing Congress to a non-entity. But we want to build up an alternative to Congress." Deendayalji looked upon participation in mixed ministries as a stepping stone to *Jana Sangh* being in full power. In the first place, formation of such mixed ministries was a way of respecting public opinion and not doing this would amount to treachery to the public. Secondly, such ministries would keep the Congress away from power, the Congress which had failed the people every way.

### Limitations of Front Governments

Front governments or mixed ministries are no novelty in democracy. If any leader claims the support of a majority in an Assembly and submits a list of his supporters to the governor, he is invited to form a ministry and he can remain in power so long as the majority supports him. Deendayalji did not expect the mixed ministries to last long. The Constitutional Law of 1935 granted provisional autonomy and elections took place in 1937. For the first time governments were formed by people's elected representatives. In some provinces the formation of mixed ministries was inevitable. The ministry in the NWF. Province was a queer mixture of Muslim League, *Hindu Mahasabha* and Akali Dal. They came together to keep away the Congress. Its leader was Aurangzeb Khan and Meharchand Khanna (*Hindu Mahasabha*) was the Finance Minister. By the end of 1941 Dr. Shyamaprasad Mookherji joined hands with Fazalul Hak of Krishak Praja Party to defeat Muslim League; Dr. Mookherji became Finance Minister in Fazalul Hak's ministry. In Europe, mixed ministries have become quite common. An unhealthy trend has, however, set in some provinces. The participants do not set their eyes on how the ideals and policies of their parties can be furthered but rather on what the personal gains will accrue from the ministerial positions. This can probably be seen as a reflection of the erosion of ethical values in the politics. The decadence has reached a point when even legislators are up for horse trading. There is open bargaining for them like marketable commodities only a price tag (Rs 2 to 20 lakhs etc) remained to be displayed.

A mixed ministry is an expression (in the legislature) of the negative vote and as such it is wrong to expect too much from it. But because the people have succeeded in throwing off Congress, their expectations from the new ministry are higher. But Deendayalji never lost his balance and could keep on an even keel in both success and failure. Hence he declared, "It was wrong to expect any miracles from these ministries in view of the present circumstances and the natural limitations of mixed ministries. We warn these governments against taking any extra-ordinary steps out of a temptation to do something dazzling. *Jana Sangh* has joined these ministries out of the conviction that today's greatest need is that its workers devote themselves whole-heartedly, tirelessly and with faith in its reclamation-programme. On this account, *Jana Sangh* will avoid all undue haste in pressing for its welfare programmes."

So far we have taken a review of Deendayalji's thoughts on contesting the fourth general elections and after achieving success in them. Nowhere do we see a desire for power at any cost or a desire to retain power by any means. Shri Krishna won the war and secured power, not for himself, but for Pandavas i.e. for *Dharma*. Similarly Deendayalji wanted *Jana Sangh* to be in power, not for sake of power, but for nationalist gains. But consistently with circumstances his directive to *Jana Sangh* workers was 'to hasten slowly' even for nationalist objectives. He wanted that *Jana Sangh*'s conduct in the mixed ministries should bring it greater glory and hence during about 14 month's tenure of ministries, he never risked any estrangement by squabbles for minister ships.

Seven months after front ministries were formed (and an equal period before they came to an end) Deendayalji commented on them while speaking in a public meeting at Aurangabad on 21st October 1967. He said, "In the recent elections, Congress has lost in several states after being in power for 20 years. Its place has been taken by mixed ministries in which *Jana Sangh* has participated. Some people are surprised that in some ministries *Jana Sangh* is there side by side with Communists. Those, who criticise *Jana Sangh* for this, should consider what the consequences would have been if *Jana Sangh* were not there. Obviously, in that case Congress would have got in to power in spite of its minority. Then, people would have lost faith in the democratic method of a desirable change. But because we carefully avoided this eventuality, not only is the people's faith in democracy unshaken but even *Jana Sangh*'s self-confidence has increased.

"There are strains enough in the mixed ministries. But it must be admitted that they have done a great deal for the people. People have felt the difference between ministries with and without *Jana Sangh* in them. While in Bengal and Kerala there is talk of insurrection against the Centre, there is no such thing in Bihar, UP or MP and the people know this. There is no slogan in Bihar etc. of 'Government *Bund* (Stop Government). Really speaking, government's duty is not to stop work but to start it."

The above is one aspect of the mixed ministries. Consider the other one now. Defection in pure self-interest became a large scale phenomenon. Congress legislators would form a group and join opposition, thus bringing down Congress ministries. In UP there was Congress ministry under the leadership of Chandrabhanu Gupta; but Charan Singh, after 45 years in Congress, formed his own group, joined the opposition and earned Chief Ministership.

In Haryana, Congress had a majority and its Chief Minister was Bhagwat Dayal Sharma, but Rao Veerendra Singh joined the opposition and became Chief Minister. In MP, Dwarika Prasad Mishra led the Congress ministry and Congress had a clear majority, but Govind Narayan Singh, with his group, left Congress, joined the opposition and thus became the Chief Minister. In UP and MP, *Jana Sangh* got Deputy Chief Ministership. In Haryana, *Jana Sangh* did not join the ministry but supported it in the Assembly.

In the three states referred to above, the voters had clearly opted for Congress. In UP Congress was short of only five legislators for a clear majority, but in MP and Hariyana it had a clear majority. But all these ministries collapsed. This collapse was obviously due to defection. So the change was not made by the people. Communists in Kerala, DMK in Madras and *Jana Sangh* in Delhi were having an absolute majority. In Rajasthan, Congress was short of one legislator in comparison with the opposition but the Governor permitted the Congress to form a government. This act of the Governor, which naturally attracted bitter criticism, though apparently undemocratic may still be regarded as excusable taking into account the rampant defection.

**Mixed Ministries: Plus and Minus Points**

The formation of mixed ministries by engineering defections and thus pulling down majority-based Congress ministries is not difficult to understand if it is remembered that Congress was originally not a party but a front for independence and in it had come together men of all shades-progressives, obscurantist, religionists, seculars, farmers, landlords, capitalists, labourers, urbans and rural. After independence, these men had become members of Assemblies and Parliament, staying together for power. This power-lust led to a superiority tussle between party-organisation and legislative party. It is thus that state Congress president Chandrabhanu Gupta removed Sampoornanand from Chief Ministership of UP. But in doing this Gupta's concern was not holding up party ideals etc. but getting Chief Ministership for himself. In all states and Centre, Congress was fractionated into large groups, but there was no open revolt anywhere as a bone was thrown to each group a ministership or a committee's chairmanship or directorship of a government corporation or at least a cement permit etc. But after Nehru, there was keen competition - in the Centre for Prime Ministership and in the states for Chief Ministerships. The goal changed from securing people's good through the medium of power to using power as a means to secure defections from the opposition, or enticing a large group from the Congress by holding out a carrot of power. Thus power no more remained a means but became an end in itself. Mixed ministries had the good effect of showing how power can be wrested from Congress. Communists (Kerala), DMK (Madras) and *Jana Sangh* (Delhi) had shown the same thing. While politics in India was passing through a confusion of party dictatorship, two-party democracy and multi-party parliamentary democracy, Deendayalji thought that, at least in the present circumstances, we have to make do with multi-party democracy. But he continued to think of how politics can be absolved from a power-lust race to an ideal of power for nationalist objectives. Multi-party governments were, according to him, the first step to destroy party dictatorship.

Because of the presence of multi-party governments in the states and the Congress government in the Centre, a new strain appeared in the Centre-state relations. The step-brotherly attitude of the Congress with non-Congress state governments was natural but undesirable. Equally undesirable was the anti-Centre stance of the states. Kerala government openly took such a stand and sought to make certain direct financial contracts with some foreign powers. This had the effect of strengthening the public desire for a strong Centre. From the beginning, *Jana Sangh* was in favour of an '*ekatma*' constitution (*ekatma* approximately means unitary). The public was slowly leaning towards this '*ekatma*' idea. How much good or bad came from the multi-party governments is a subject for independent research. But there can be no two opinions that the one-party dictatorship nurtured by Nehru had to be terminated. For treating diseases it is now a days common medical practice to give sulpha drugs which have undesirable side effects, which require treatment later on. Similarly, the bad side effects of multi-party systems etc. could be treated later. But the political doctor Deendayalji, who could have done this, was murdered before he had a chance to do so.

## Threat to Democracy from Nehru Himself

Twenty years earlier, Congress was in a strong position and there was no threat to its power. Naturally Congressmen could afford to brag about democracy; but really speaking their love of democracy was a facade for their love of power. When the whole world was praising Nehru as a great democrat, Deendayalji in July 1961 had warned, "Time has come when all democrats in this country must seriously think and act accordingly before a Castro rises here and takes over." In an article he has discussed, in his easy style, the intolerant and parochial attitude of Nehru and other Congressmen. The article also explains why he was so eager to dethrone Congress and why he asked *Jana Sangh* to participate in multi-party governments. He writes, "The most important requirement for success of a democracy is unattachment to power. Like Prabhu Ramachandra, one must be ever ready either to step into or step off power, unmindful of any personal loss in losing power. As in a game, one can try his best for success but like a sportsman he must accept defeat with a smile and congratulate the winner. Anybody without this sportsman spirit is no democrat at all. It was in this spirit that Churchill handed over power to Atlee and Atlee to Eden. "But what do we see here? In some states Congress has lost power and also lost some by-elections of prestige. Nehru and Congressmen have not accepted that defeat like sportsmen. The way they behaved after reverses in Delhi Lok Sabha constituency and in Kamalanagar (Delhi) municipal corporation by-elections, shows very clearly how anti-democratic they are; they went on to talk of banning *Jana Sangh*. Such a ban will make the Congress position still worse and is therefore not possible. But the very thought exposes them.

"Anybody can brag of being a thorough democrat until majority of votes in elections are casted in his favour. But the real testing time comes when he gets defeated in the election and is required to vacate the seat of power for his opponent who has won people's trust. A Congressman is loyal to his party, but when? Either when he gets an election-ticket or has ample opportunity of grazing other benefits of power....Congress does not want people's government; it likes such people who would 'honestly' vote always for Congress only. "Keeping all this in view, the greatest threat to democracy appears to be from Congress quarters. For several years Nehru is widely spoken of as a democrat. But it is because of Nehru's thoughts and expressions that Congress has become anti-democratic. All lovers of democracy must seriously think and act in time lest a Castro may emerge here." The above quotation from Deendayalji's article brings out Deendayalji's thoughts. What he did through *Jana Sangh* was responsible for the Congress loss of power in many states and of the reduction of Congress strength in Lok Sabha from 361 to 283. History is evidence to the fact that compared to the group tiding to stick on to power for its own sake, even a small but idealist group proves more effective. It was a special characteristic of Deendayalji that while playing politics to ever get closer to power, he and his *Jana Sangh* never lost sight of their ideals; power is only a means for it.

Deendayalji worked to release the country from the Congress strangle-hold. It will be useful to briefly review here, in so far as democracy is concerned, the past actions of Congress leaders. Lokmanya Tilak was a hard line politician against the British and was jailed at Mandalay for 6 years on this account. After he was set free, he tried to further the cause of independence by coming to terms with the moderates in the Congress. Then began the Gandhian era. Like any other leader, Gandhiji formed his own group and initiated many movements and agitations. Due to his ability and sacrifice, he became the country's top leader. Gradually, however, died away the democratic virtues of liberalism, tolerance and unattachment to power. He began to look upon everybody who differed from him, as his rival. A case in point is that of Subhash Chandra Bose. The Congress elected Bose as its President and this, Gandhi did not like. Gandhi considered it as a threat to his personal power and used all sorts of means to force Bose to resign. While holding talks with Jinnah, Gandhi did not take Congress working committee into confidence.

In response to Jinnah's demands, he gave a blank cheque to Jinnah on behalf of Congress. Savarkar appealed to the National Flag Committee that in place of 'Charkha' the flag should have a 'wheel' on it and the committee adopted 'Ashoka chakra'. Gandhi was wild with rage and declared, "If the flag does not show a 'Charkha' on Khadi, I shall have nothing to do with it and I shall not salute it." This shows his dictatorial tendency and intolerance. Savarkar did his best that the *Bharatiya* national flag should be saffron in colour. His telegram to the flag committee was, "The flag of independent *Bharat* should be saffron in colour. If there is not even a saffron strip on it, it will not be acceptable to Hindus." Even then on the first Independence Day Savarkar unfurled on his house the tricolour with Ashoka Chakra. Gandhiji's views on the flag are given above to expose his extreme autocratic thinking. At the beginning his long fasts were (at least in his declarations) for purification of his mind and for persuasion, but later the fasts became a method of pressurising his colleagues. His fast at Rajkot failed as the minister Veeravala did not yield to the pressure. But his fast tactics succeeded in pressurizing *Bharat* government to pay Rs. 55 crores to Pakistan.

Pandit Nehru was extremely intolerant. In an article, which he wrote under a pen-name and before independence, he had warned, "There is a danger that because of his popularity Pandit Nehru may become an autocrat any moment." This has come true many times in his 17 years of post-independence career. The first autocratic action consisted in his mis-leading the people on Kashmir. It was his sweet will to hand over power to Sheikh Abdulla, losing *Bharatiya* territory by inordinate haste in ordering cease fire and abridging *Bharatiya* sovereignty in Kashmir by giving Kashmir a separate constitution (by article 370 which he declared as a temporary measure). Kashmir was granted the right of a referendum in his self-assumed authority. Even while declaring that the amalgamation of Kashmir with *Bharat* was irrevocable and that part of Kashmir (the so called Azad Kashmir) beyond the cease fire line was an inseparable part of *Bharat*, he secretly promised Pak Prime Minister

Mohammed Ali to gift away 'Azad Kashmir'. Nehru also made a pact with Pak Prime Minister Ferozekhan Noon to part with the *Bharatiya* territory of Berubari and the people knew nothing about it until Noon boasted about it in Pak Assembly. China seized thousands of square miles of *Bharatiya* territory and Nehru kept the Lok Sabha and the people in dark about it.

## Multi-party Governments in National Interest

In addition to his autocratic and treacherous behaviour, Nehru was disrespectful to men who had sacrificed their all for the country's independence. Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji was the leader of opposition in Parliament. When he was in Kashmir jail, Nehru had not the courtesy to enquire after his comfort in jail. Later Dr. Mookherji died in jail in suspicious circumstances and his mother demanded an enquiry. But Nehru set aside this democratic demand. Nehru used to shower praise on Abdulla but shed tears when he had to be arrested on charges of treachery. People clamoured for action against the corrupt Punjab Chief Minister Kairon but Nehru paid no attention. Against people's will, he always backed the Arab nations. The moment Dwarika Prasad Mishra raised his voice against Nehru, Nehru drove him away from the political field. A sage like Rajarshi Tandon was displaced from Congress-Presidentship just like Subhash Chandra Bose. Tandon's sin, for which Nehru never forgave him, was his opposition to partition. In the Parliament itself, Nehru had threatened Dr. Mookherji by saying, "I will crush you." Of course, this did not frighten Dr. Mookherji who, earlier, had the courage, during Dacca riots, to go unattended into the Nawab's strong hold to tell him that he was answerable for the riots. Like Savarkar, Dr. Mookherji was a real democrat and he readily answered Nehru by saying, "I will crush your crushing mentality."

As the threat to his personal power grew, Nehru dropped his show of democracy. In Kerala, Communists defeated Congress. Contrary to democratic conventions Nehru tried to pull down Communist government by taking help of Muslim League and Christian missionaries. He would not tolerate opposition even from great patriots, if they held views different from his. Thus able and eminent men like Dr. Mookherji, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar and Chintamanirao Deshmukh left the Central ministry. Though each had left under different circumstances, they all suffered from his intolerant autocracy. Chinese aggression was a national calamity and according to democratic conventions Nehru should have formed a national government. Nehru not only failed to do this, but he did not even care to arrange consultation with the opposition.

Nehru's autocracy was infectious. Every state had a party-boss; the Chief Ministers became belligerent Chief Minister from Kairon to Kamaraj and Patnaik to Morarji became, in their administration, heedless of people's sentiments. Gradually the administration of the whole country became a tool in the hands of a few party-bosses and the bureaucracy. Deendayalji's effort was to save the country from this dual autocracy. He looked upon multi-party governments as a first step in loosening the stranglehold. Deendayalji did not have the slightest doubt in his mind that in case the Congress, which boasted of securing independence for the country, remained in power for some more time, the country will be ruined - the country will be economically enslaved to foreign capitalists and countries, corruption will become rampant and appeasement of anti-national forces will disgrace and dishearten the Hindus. Deendayalji wanted to inspire confidence in the people that they can terminate such spineless, treacherous and undemocratic government.

* * *

## 9

# Why *Jana Sangh*?

**D**eendayalji organised an all-*Bharat* party and in about 16 years he raised it to the status of a future ruling party. A ruling party must have a philosophy, a policy, a leader, workers and a programme. These are the five organs of the party and every one of these must be sound and efficient.

In order that the party organisation may be well balanced, Deendayalji constantly toured, read and thought. He carefully observed the people's condition and planned programmes based on it. He trained the workers who would implement the programmes which would improve the people's condition. The improvement would bring forth new workers who would be trained in turn. While doing all this, he would sift the grain from the chaff and concentrate on the fundamentals. He was busy with day-to-day politics and was guiding *Jana Sangh* in successfully contesting elections from the '*gram panchayats*' to centrally administered Delhi. This is the description of Deendayalji the politician-unattached par excellence and having malice towards none. In his political career of 16 years, he never hatched any plots, nor ever equivocated. His thoughts were clear and he would express them in a simple and straight forward way. Even while inspiring a worker to be ready to sacrifice his all for the country, Deendayalji would guide him in improving his own condition. It is rare to find a political leader like Deendayalji who personally knew innumerable workers even at the lowest level. For training the workers he organised study camps on a large scale. His learned discourses employed simple language and the manner was unassuming.

He was not interested in workers who would work only during the occasional elections. He wanted workers who would think all the time about the country's good and who would be sacrificing whenever the occasion so demanded. Guru Govind Singh used to say, 'I shall make hawks out of sparrows and make each of my soldiers fight a lakh of enemies. 'Tradition' has it that Shalivahan transformed clay models of soldiers into real first class warriors. From out of villagers, who only knew farming, Shivaji made brave and skilled warriors. This is history. From out of ordinary men, not used to politics, Deendayalji wanted to shape devoted political workers who would efficiently run administration. He worked tirelessly to this end for 16 years.

What was his outlook throughout the many agitations he conducted during this period? He says, "The run of events during the last fifty years has been such that the moments we talk of agitation, there come to our mind, jail, '*satyagraha*' non-payment of taxes and revenue etc. Really speaking, no independent country should have any need of such agitations. But fact is that such a need is felt here. And this shows the government's unwillingness to honour the people's will. We must, however, bear in mind that such an agitation is the last weapon we should resort to. *Jana Sangh* does not believe in '*satyagraha*' as its creed. But only when it is forced by circumstances, does *Jana Sangh* resort to such means in order to bend the government to the popular will. We desire that meetings, resolutions and memoranda should be adequate for the expression of the popular will and for government's implementation thereof. In the absence of such peaceful expression and implementation, the whole atmosphere will be in a state of great strain."

## Agitations and their Limitations

The moderates of the second half of the 19th century used to think that a day will come when the British will quit power and all that is necessary to bring this about is that we should become wise and incessantly go on pouring on the British our prayers. This wishful thinking is illustrated by what Lok Hitwadi wrote in one of the essays in 1849. The essay says, "When people become wise, they will meekly ask the British to grant us a parliament on the British pattern. When this wish is granted, people will gradually say to the British, 'Now that we have become wise, why not give us powers? When the majority of Hindus demand this, the British will have no option but to grant this second wish also. When the 'natives' are able to handle the administration well and when corruption vanishes, natives will even be made governors and the British will concentrate only on their trade interests." Of course, the British were no fools and Lok Hitwadi had some misgivings that in future the British may not be quite reasonable and that momentous agitations may be needed to drive out the British.

The above quotation from Lok Hitwadi is intended to bring out the similarity between the leech-like sticking to power in the case of British in *Bharat* and in the case of the Congress in the post-independence period. In the case of the British, Lok Hitwadi had suggested persuasion as a first step and in the case of the Congress, Deendayalji talks of using mild popular expressions, reserving harsher remedies in case the party in power fails to respond to popular will. The Congress did not stop at corruption; it became shameless. It was the same with Kauravas who refused to part with even a microscopic piece of land. It was only then, when all attempts at compromise and persuasion had failed, that Pandavas had recourse to war. Deendayalji, in saving the country from Congress, also went step by step.

Deendayalji, while agitating against Congress maladministration, never permitted *Jana Sangh* workers either to lose their temper or to be hasty. In the '*Kashmir Satyagraha*' of *Jana Sangh*, the police excesses against the '*Satyagrahis*' resulted in the death of 40 workers. Nehru had openly instigated Sheikh Abdulla. When a voice was raised in Lok Sabha against Abdulla's atrocities on Satyagrahis, Nehru tried to justify Abdulla's action by saying, "Sheikh Abdulla has been very mild. I would have crushed the agitation." In spite of the atrocities and Nehru's arrogance, Deendayalji (and Dr. Mookherji while he lived) taught workers not to be mad with vengeance but to convert their anger into people's dissatisfaction. Fifty years earlier, Lokmanya Tilak was acclaimed as the 'Father of Indian unrest' against the British. And now Deendayalji was 'the father of Indian unrest' against the Congress - this unrest was far more widely spread and was better-organised into a force. The 'morcha' in, protest of Kachchha-pact was the form the unrest was given. A Socialist leader said to Deendayalji that if the Socialists could have taken out such a 'morcha' of 5 lakh people, they would have reduced Lok Sabha to rubble. Deendayalji replied, "That's where we differ. You are out to destroy Parliament and democracy. But we want a majority in Lok Sabha in the interest of democracy and people's welfare."

### The Ideal Worker

With independence rose people's expectation that all people will be inspired with the ideal of reconstruction, '*Swadeshl* and self-reliance, but there was complete frustration. Nehru and his Congress, in place of leading the country's development, concentrated on personal importance and extension of their power areas. The power bestowed by the people in five-yearly elections was used, not for strengthening people's unity but for dividing the people by sowing dissentions among them. Had the Congress Party workers been selfless and honest, then the bureaucracy and the ruling party could not have worked, hand in glove, to breed unchecked corruption. Had social evils been eliminated, the people would have become wiser. But the ruling party, in its own interest, thought it shrewder to enforce removal of social evils by enactments, thus killing people's social initiative. It was necessary to break this vicious circle and to make independence dynamic and give it a worthy aim. This transformation was hardly to be expected at the hands of parties which had originated in 'Congress culture', or the Communist Party, or the Muslim-parties which had supported Pakistan. Only *Jana Sangh* could stand up to the challenge as it had an independent and nationalistic philosophy, line of thinking, policy and programme. And hence Deendayalji developed workers and evolved agitations to face the challenge. A little before the 1962 elections, he had penned three articles under the title 'Your Vote'. They describe the suitability of candidate for the election. In them he says, "Only one who has worked in the constituency, who can give vent to the people's aspirations and who can adequately ventilate people's sentiments etc. in the legislature can be a suitable candidate. Further he must have dedicated his life to people's service and is sure to work single mindedly for the party, following the party discipline. He may in addition, have additional good qualities but none of them can be a substitute for any of the earlier mentioned qualifications."

The above quotation describes Deendayalji's ideas of a suitable candidate for election. But the quotation also describes his expectations from a worker. Such a worker must be observant and inquisitive; he must have a clear perspective of the circumstances and any remedies he seeks should go to the root of the things and he should not indulge in patchwork solutions. The worker must have the good of his locality at heart, must give the people proper guidance and must not shrink from agitation when the occasion so demands. But in the case of an agitation he must bear in mind its pros and cons and limitations. In 1957 Communists came to power in Kerala; this became unbearable to Nehru and the Congress and they started an agitation to pull down Communists from power. Since *Jana Sangh* is opposed to Communism, many expected *Jana Sangh* to join the agitation. But on the contrary, Deendayalji said in a public meeting at Delhi, "*Jana Sangh* believes that people have every right to agitate against rulers who are corrupt and anti-people. But the agitation going on in Kerala at present is rather complicated. The present agitation is an attempt to pull down a government which has constitutionally come to power. It is true that Communists are anti-democratic and it is also true that there is a limit to people's forbearance; even then I feel that the agitation led by Congress and other parties is neither politically wise nor states-manly. I do not feel that Nehru and his Congress have really appreciated the risk to the country from Communists and their 'ism'. But if they have perceived the risk, they should not limit the anti-Communism agitation to Kerala but they should make it countrywide."

We should not assist any agitator simply because the agitation is against our opponent. It is not always correct to say that 'enemy's enemy is our friend.' Deendayalji never thought it proper to help Christian missionaries, simply because the missionaries were engaged in dethroning the Communists, as his politics was not for power but for nationalist aims. Deendayalji wanted to impress on the workers this subtle but important point. He wanted *Jana Sangh* workers to be free from communal considerations in selecting candidates for elections or while working in any constituency. He used to say, "In selecting a candidate consider, not his community, but his suitability and patriotism." As an example, he quoted the case of Dr. Lohia. He said, "Dr. Lohia was refused a ticket (by his 'Socialist' party) from a certain constituency in UP, because Dr. Lohia did not belong to the community which dominated the constituency. The real remedy against this evil lies in strengthening party-organisation and make party's work more extensive and deep and to teach people to be free from communal considerations. Unfortunately Dr. Lohia is thinking the wrong way and demanding reservation of 60 per-cent seats for backward communities." Both by his conduct and by his talks in study camps Deendayalji insisted that *Jana Sangh* politics must not do anything to divide the people or the country. After Chinese aggression, in a Parliament by-election, he helped Dr. Lohia and Minoo Masani to win, but he himself was defeated in Jaunpur constituency. The candidate opposing him in Jaunpur was a 'Thakur' and 'Thakurs' dominated the area. Deendayalji took his defeat sportively and attributed his defeat, not to communal vote but to his opponent's suitability. He was meticulously careful to properly nurture *Jana Sangh* workers as the future rulers.

## Economic Independence of *JanaISangh*

In the Congress regime, it had become common practice for voters to 'get things done' through the elected representatives. This reduced the usefulness of a Congress worker only to the election period and the Congress party machinery had become virtually an election machinery. Actually the government must be disciplined by and also be assisted by the elected representatives. But this does not obtain now a days. Let us take a simple example. Government has sanctioned schemes for granting loans to farmers for farm implements, seeds and pumps. But administration raises many difficulties in the way of farmers in getting the subsidy or loan. And it is in this that the Legislator's duty comes in. But in the Congress regime the elected Legislator would, generally, be willing to help the needy farmer 'for a price' and the 'profits' would be shared between the bureaucracy and the Legislator. This is corruption - pure and simple. Deendayalji preached, "An election-candidate or a worker must devote himself to people's service and must also follow party's discipline." The selfless worker of Deendayalji's dreams was expected to clean up Aegean's stables of corruption. If election funds are raised by large contributions, corruption is ensured in a big way and hence he insisted its collection from *Jana Sangh* workers and supporters. He had high hopes about the outcome of 1967 elections - of Congress losses and *Jana Sangh* gains. But elections need money and he was careful that the mode of its collection should avoid likely future pressure on *Jana Sangh*'s principles. On 21st September 1966, was held Maharashtra *Jana Sangh*'s annual session at Aurangabad. Thus ran his directions to his workers, "There should not be any Assembly constituency which has not contributed its mite to our election fund. In every constituency find people who will donate 10 paise everyday from 21st October (The *Jana Sangh* inception day)." In the three and a half months between 21st October and the election time, this would amount roughly to Rs. 10/- per head. With this would the party secure his vote and assistance. This would avoid economic pressure on *Jana Sangh* when it comes to power.

Deendayalji was a '*swayamsevak*' (volunteer) of RSS and was very proud of it. He had thoroughly inculcated in himself the virtues preached in RSS. While working in *Jana Sangh* he had adopted several unusual methods used in RSS. There had been a lot of discussion on the RSS funds built out of '*gurudakshina*' (voluntary offerings to '*bhagawa dhwaj*, the '*Guru*' (mentor) of RSS Volunteers). The ruling party had been arrogant enough to think of levying income tax on RSS. There were several other institutions working in the social field. But it was RSS which initiated a self-reliant funding method which also inspired a spirit of selfless sacrifice in a noble cause; the method was eminently successful. In an atmosphere surcharged with corruption, at all levels and in all walks of life, RSS has retained its purity in thought and action. Taking large contributions from the rich was a sort of invitation to undesirable pressure, for nearly none pays in a big way for nothing. This has been the bane of other institutions and the root of corruption. But the RSS way of raising the necessary funds was self-reliant, voluntary and arising out of faith in RSS. Deendayalji adopted this method for *Jana Sangh* with some changes. Vinobaji introduced the method in which every family sets aside a vessel (to be called gift-vessel) into which the family puts a handful of corn everyday. Vishwa *Hindu* Parishad appealed all Hindus to set aside 5 to 10 paise per day for VHP. Three decades earlier Jayaprakash Narayan had demanded an hour's time per day from every Indian, his slogan being 'an hour for the country'. The attempt of all these men and institutions has been to achieve economic independence, enabling ideals to be followed unhampered. The dependence on America forced devaluation of Rupee on us and the dependence on Russia forced Tashkent pact down our throat. Deendayalji had seen all these things happen; he was very careful to avoid all economic pressure in intraparty matters, in *Jana Sangh*'s politics and nationalist programmes. He wanted *Jana Sangh* to be in power and wanted to use this power for people's welfare, not by promoting selfish middle men but through workers committed to the people, to the country, to the party and to its principles. He tried to train and develop workers and through them he wished to change the conditions here, for power in the hands of Congress was like power in the hands of Duryodhan. In Calicut, in his concluding presidential speech, Deendayalji said, "We are committed to the service, not of any class or sect, but of the whole of nation and we shall not stop until we bring our people the honour and status due to them as the sons and daughters of *Bharat Mata*. We shall make our *Bharat Mata* '*Sujala*' (with plenty of good water) and '*suphala*' (bearing plenty of fruits and cereals etc.) in the real sense. This *Bharat Mata*, as Durga bearing ten weapons, will destroy evil powers, as Laxmi will keep all above want and as Saraswati will spread light of knowledge. Our efforts, like those of Bhagirath, will continue until this land, bounded by Himalaya and the seas, is blessed with the seven 'Jahnavees' viz. homogeneity, patriotism, equality, affluence, knowledge, happiness and peace. The gods, Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh will surely bless our efforts. We are confident of success. Let us march forward, sparing no pain and stopping not till our goal is reached."

**Principles - No Compromise**

Deendayalji would agree to compromise on party programmes and during the tenure of the coalition ministries had warned the *Jana Sangh* partners therein not to be too hasty or to stretch to breaking point. But he never compromised on principles, for, that would render meaningless all our efforts. There was no point in being able to secure some ministerships if it is at the cost of sacrificing the ideal of undivided *Bharat*. He protested against government not applying to Maharashtra the principle applied elsewhere during reconstruction of states; he permitted *Jana Sangh* to participate in the consequent agitation. He was, however, all the time upholding an '*ekatma*' (unitary) administrative system for the country.

Due to Chinese aggression the people had become anti-China and because of timely American aid during the aggression, many people were inclining towards America, resulting in a popular support to Swatantra Party. In fact, some thought it desirable that *Jana Sangh* and Swantantra Party should merge. The provincial Presidents and Secretaries of Swatantra Party started coming to *Jana Sangh* session as guests or observers. Deendayalji was very carefully watching these developments. Deendayalji expressed himself thus: "Swatantra Party has its own identity. Swatantra Party leaders must give second thoughts to reasons why earlier they thought it necessary to form a separate party while *Jana Sangh* was already in existence. And supposing that the reasons were OK then another question arises 'if they continue to exist today also', because in that case unity will be impossible. Swatantra Party leaders would do well to discuss this matter amongst them rather than with *Jana Sangh*." The implication was obviously that Deendayalji was not at all ready to compromise on principles.

Rajaji, the founder of SP (Swatantra Party) had suggested that Kashmir issue should be handed over to UNO Deendayalji reacted: "Some in this country are suggesting parting with Kashmir as a solution of Kashmir muddle. This propaganda must be stopped forthwith as this is against the country's integrity and unity." Regarding what Minoo Masani, General Secretary of *Swatantra* Party, had said, Deendayalji's thoughts were clear: "Recently at Hyderabad, General Secretary of Swatantra Party is known to have said that unless *Jana Sangh* gives up its stand on Kashmir and Pakistan, *Swatantra* Party will not come to terms with *Jana Sangh*. I am thankful to Masani for being very frank; he has freed us from the understanding we had with *Swatantra* Party for the elections. *Swatantra* Party's stace on Kashmir and Pakistan had become a headache for us." A *Jana Sangh* resolution had it that Article 370 in the Constitution should be deleted, the aggressors should be driven out and Kashmir should be fully integrated with *Bharat*. It also said emphatically that Pakistan is an aggression on *Bharat*, the partition must be annulled and Pakistan must be liberated. The conditions for unity of *Jana Sangh* and Swatantra Party stipulated by Masani simply expose his ignorance of the faith and solidity of "Deendayalji and *Jana Sangh*."

### A Party is Not Just a Power Seeking Group

We should always keep our manifesto before our eyes so that neither our workers nor the people (we approach) ever lose sight of the ideals or of the purpose for which power is sought. While describing what is a good party, he says, "What is a good party? A party is not a group of men come together merely to secure power, but it is an institution with an ideal. An ideal party never looks upon power as an end in itself but looks upon power as a means to an end. Workers at all levels must have faith in the ideal or goal; it is out of this faith that hard work and discipline arise. Discipline is not merely following of a set of dos and don'ts for practical efficiency. As the externalities of discipline multiply, further goes down the inner strength. What '*Dharma*' is to a people, discipline is to a party." His insistence on the eternal remembrance of the manifesto is due to its emphasis on party ideals and principles.

Now a days it is fashionable among people to say that the manifestos of all parties are good or similar. But the hitch is that even some workers of the party fail to see that their party's principles are different and so is their election manifesto. Election speeches mostly attack opponents instead of putting forth the positive side. Deendayalji, in his election speeches, used to explain at some length the party's manifesto so that people may know what *Jana Sangh* will do for them if it comes to power. Congress came to power and passed many Acts hoping thereby to fulfil their promises in the manifesto, but the Acts remained only on the statute books because the Congress workers were never really inspired by the policies in the manifesto. A Socialist of yesterday becomes a Congressite today or a Muslim Leaguer joins Congress, but neither has any commitment to Congress ideals or policies; the change was made only as a means to attain power. But through his workers, Deendayalji wanted to inaugurate a new era and hence his emphasis on the party workers having clear ideas and firm faiths. *Jana Sangh* manifesto promised a common civil code as religions were not to be allowed to divide people. The Congress also boasted of secularism but in practice, its politics was based on not only communal but on caste and provincial considerations. A common civil code would make all equal before law, as it should; it was no intervention in any religion. A religion should be limited to an individual's chosen way of his spiritual development. But no religion should be allowed to dabble in matters that affect the other people - like polygamy, divorce or family planning, all of which must be legally controlled. And further, this law must be *Bharatiya* in spirit and conception and not mimicry of Mecca-Medina or Rome. This is the extent and depth of even a single statement in the manifesto; it is only through a deep thought that its real significance will be appreciated. When the party comes to power, with the backing of these devoted and properly trained workers, things will begin to move. Hence Deendayalji attached great importance to the special features of *Jana Sangh* manifesto" such as the stoppage of cow-slaughter, undivided *Bharat*, *Ekatma* administration, service co-operatives for farming (and not co-operative farming) and citizen's fundamental right to bear some arms. The manifesto also gives an idea of Jana Sangh's foreign policy in that it proposes to stop import of American cereals and to import rice from Burma and other South East Asian countries. It was made clear to Jana Sangh workers that it was for these things that Jana Sangh wanted power and so right from the beginning their minds were kept free from any personal ends. All his thinking and work among Jana Sangh workers was to prepare them for the onerous task of changing the thousand year history of foreign rule, foreign dependence, poverty, dishonour, fractionation and social injustice. His party-work was in every sense national work. In elections Jana Sangh contested as many seats as possible and so was ridiculed, on earlier occasions, as the deposit losing party. Be it as it may, Deendayalji persisted in directing his party to continue this policy for, apart from success or failure, it gave the party an opportunity to contact the electorate and tell them about *Jana Sangh*'s ideals, policies and programmes. As a worker speaks more and more about his party's principles etc. apart from impressing his listeners, he himself is a gainer in that his ideas continue to be clearer. Deendayalji has said in this connection, "Both seats and votes are important in elections and hence I feel that we should contest maximum number of seats. Even if there is a failure, the votes secured are a gain for further work. Also, people, who share our ideas, are not forced to vote for others. So, no seat must be left untried. We must cover the entire area of our field of work. It is risky not to do so."

*Jana Sangh* thought should saturate the atmosphere; today's opponent should be our voter tomorrow and later the voter should be our active worker. We should have agitations in various places but *Jana Sangh* work should not begin with an agitation, which should be the last resort. An agitation should be undertaken only after we are satisfied that it is fully justified and after we are sure that the quality and number of our workers are such as can utilise, for the party development, the awakening among the people which the agitation will bring about. But until that time, party-propaganda should be carried on through public meetings, get-togethers and demonstrations. So thought Deendayalji. In his annual report at a *Jana Sangh* session he said, "No party can afford to stay away from any question of national importance. But I think it is necessary that we should pay special attention and lay more emphasis on local questions. Agitations on national issues are important for the creation and development of national unity and patriotism among even the common men. Unfortunately every agitation on a national issue is given by the Government the form of a showdown between the Government and the people. Instead of trying to understand the people, Government does all it can to suppress the people and their agitation, thinking that this suppression upholds government's honour and status. The result is dissatisfaction among the people and the dissatisfaction perhaps brings some temporary advantage to some political parties. But the effect on the political life of the country is unhealthy. If the government does not take cognizance of people's complaints, the people begin to behave irresponsibly and there are also some parties, which out of selfish motives, go on constantly carrying on *Satyagrahas* and agitations. This makes both the people's behaviour and the governmental treatment thereof irrational. "As an example, while referring to *Samyukta* Maharashtra agitation, Deendayalji said, "What Central Home Minister Pandit Pant said in the Parliament vis-a-vis bifurcation of the Bombay province, is indicative of the way Congressmen think. They are clearly out to disrespect people's sentiments and appear to be determined to suppress the popular demand. There appears to be an open war between the people and the government. When government takes recourse to violence to suppress people's opposition, the people also become violent."

Though Deendayalji wanted to conduct agitations, he was worried lest agitations strike at the roots of democracy bringing mutual communication and understanding to an end. A revolution destroys but it can also reconstruct. Deendayalji wanted a revolution which was not simply destructive. This could be achieved only through the co-operation of all. And hence he said, "The ruling party and the opposition must together evolve a way of meeting people's complaints." Just as all parties must come together in a national calamity, so also they must come together to avoid an internal impasse. Deendayalji was no selfish politician to exploit any distressful condition in the country; this is what external enemies and internal trouble makers would do. This is why when China attacked India in 1962, he immediately halted *Jana Sangh* agitations and used the energy, thus saved, in the cause of defence.

Even in Jana Sangh agitations in peace time he was careful lest there be undesirable social side effects. As an example, let us consider the Jana Sangh Food *Satyagraha* in UP at the time of famine in 1958. While bringing out the difference between Jana Sangh and other parties he said, "In the *Satyagraha*, Jana Sangh has placed four principal demands before the government: (1) In the famine affected area, recovery of land revenue should be temporarily postponed, (2) There should be cheap corn shop for every 5000 people, (3) The students of famine-affected areas should be exempted from paying fees, (4) Those, without any means of subsistence, should be given free rations. Jana Sangh workers have undertaken '*Ghera Dalo*' (To surround government official's etc. making their normal working difficult and thus obliging them to pay attention to people's complaints) programmes in government offices and are trying to prevent government employees from attending offices. The object in all *Jana Sangh* actions is to focus government attention on the seriousness of the situation and to speed up necessary government action and not formation of a parallel government. Contrast this with what the Praja Socialist Party is doing. This party has tried to seize by force government granaries and looted granaries at Mathura and

Farrukhabad. *Jana Sangh* has strongly protested against this as it will spread chaos in the province."

## Ideals of Dayanand and Tilak

It was indeed very painful that in a famine period a simple demand for temporary suspension of land revenue recovery should necessitate an agitation. Even in famine code, made by British government a hundred years back, top priority was given to temporary suspension of land revenue recovery. If a *Jana Sangh* worker, on the strength of an agitation, would like to ask the government for much more, Deendayalji would say, "If you place yourselves in the position of the rulers, you may realise that it is not practicable to satisfy fabulous demands. Never forget that you may be the rulers tomorrow."

What were the models placed before *Jana Sangh* in its political, social and economic thinking and activities? In an article published before the 1962 elections, Deendayalji has briefly answered this question. "*Jana Sangh* will not blindly adopt Western thoughts and ways. *Jana Sangh* draws its inspiration from the eternal values in life as expressed in the *Bharatiya* culture. *Jana Sangh* is marching along the path of progress prescribed by Swami Dayanand Saraswati and Lokmanya Tilak and founded in our traditions. These improvements are not limited to social field; *Jana Sangh* is making attempts to apply these principles also to the economic field." His advice to the people is that they should vote according to their conscience. His frank suggestion was, "If you wish status quo to continue, vote for Swatantra Party. If you want a party which imitates the West, vote for any Socialist Party. But if you wish to modernise and also to ennoble your life without giving up our ancient values in life, then support only *Jana Sangh*." The words bear no ill will towards *Swatantras* or Socialists. Lokmanya Tilak died in 1920. It is significant that after a lapse of 40 years from this event, Deendayalji places Tilak's ideals before the people, in all fields. Gandhiji's aims in politics were also nationalistic but his politics had the stigma of Muslim appeasement, resulting in the partition of *Bharat*. Gandhiji's politics was for the people and by persuasion and mutual understanding, but he could not tolerate the democratic election of Subhash Chandra Bose to presidentship of Congress, as it was against Gandhiji's will. He considered it important not to hurt leaders like Nehru and Patel while consenting to country's partition. He said that in the then circumstances it was unwise to weaken Congress in any way; Gandhi had no intention to challenge the Congress leadership and thus destroy people's faith in it. It is clear why Deendayalji, 40 years after Tilak's death, turned to Tilak. Tilak didn't compromise on national interests. British government was ready to release Tilak (from Mandalay jail), on condition that the latter abjure politics. But Tilak agreed not. He was certain that independence would come only through people's awakening and through hard line politics. For his hard line politics he paid the price of six years in Mandalay jail. But seeing that the mass awakening was not up to the mark, he agreed to come to terms with the moderates. After Tilak, Gandhi era began. He had faith in the British sense of justice. On this Tilak differed sharply from Gandhi, but made no efforts at all to oust Gandhi. He treated him with great respect. Gandhi left off the moderates and started a countrywide '*Satyagraha*' against Roulette Act. That time Tilak was in England. The moment he set his foot on Indian soil at Bombay port, he declared: "If I were here, I would have participated in Gandhi's *Satyagraha*." By his declaration '*Swarajya* is my birth right', at one stroke Tilak made all considerations of individuals, parties, institutions and programmes subservient to national interests. Deendayalji's goals such as the complete independence of the nation, re-establishment of undivided *Bharat*, national reconstruction and modernisation without sacrificing our traditional values in life were all nationalist faiths. Party, Programmes, elections, '*morchas*', workers, organisation, compromises, pacts, - all were meant for the nation; for the nation, he wanted to live and for the nation he would die. This was the inner urge of Deendayalji in choosing Dayanand and Tilak as the models to copy. These giants would brush aside everything else if it came in the way of their faith in our culture and their aspirations of social and national renaissance. ■

## 10

# The Game Ended Half Way

Deendayalji was a simple man, simple in his dress, manners and food habits. He would express himself in a simple language. But after a famous economist had some discussion with Deendayalji, the former remarked about the latter, "Of course, his attire is simple, but his thoughts are remarkable."

His thoughts were certainly remarkable, for he could perceive what must be done to undo the damage done by the foreign aggression of the past twelve and a half centuries and to bring back peace, stability, abundance and honour to this land and its people. He was fully aware that human life is multifaceted and so out of his versatile genius he produced his philosophy of Integral Humanism. The poet Shelley spoke of Shakespeare thus, "He saw life full and whole." This statement of Shelley seems to be fully justified if one observes the innumerable variety of situations and human traits delineated by Shakespeare in his dramas from Tempest to Othello. Similarly, if we observe the extent and depth of Deendayalji's thoughts on various subjects, we are convinced of the fullness and wholeness of his concept of man. In spite of all that has been said in this book so far about his political ideology and perception, much more may have been left out; yet what has been said here is, I suppose, adequate to introduce the reader to his unadulterated and unambiguous nationalist thoughts and actions.

## Urge for All Round Independence

Islamic aggression began here twelve and a half centuries back and it upset all life here. Foreign rule does not remain limited to political power but casts its ugly shadow on every walk of life. The wise Birbal becomes an Akbar's jester and a learned '*Panditraj*' Jagannath bows before a Shahjahan for exemption from the cursed Jazia tax. And as a further example consider Shahji; a political and military genius of his stature rules a whole Muslim kingdom in the name of a one and half year old toddler, Murtaja. Mohammed Tughlak spends billions of rupees of tax payer's money in a disastrous attempt to build a new capital (a thousand miles away), complete with royal bathing houses and Zananas and luxury palaces. In those times, government did not control all walks of life and yet the *Hindu* populace was reduced to abject poverty. In those times, any damsel from any family would be pounced upon and made a slave-mistress of any khan; any moment anybody would be deprived of all his possessions; life was hard and uncertain and spiritual progress (so dear to a *Hindu* heart) could not even be thought of. As Swatantryaveer Savarkar has said, "Everything that is highest, noblest, best and sweetest dwells in thou, oh! Goddess Independence." Exactly the opposite is true in dependence. During the twelve and a half centuries of foreign yoke, lakhs of patriots fought with all their might, from Banda Vairagi to Subhash Chandra Bose and from Bappa Raval to Chhatrapati Shivaji; they held the Hindus together and the people surged forward and won many a glorious battle. When the British eliminated the Muslim rulers here, Raja Rammohan Roy, the great thinker, breathed a great sigh of relief for at the long last the country was free from the yoke of Muslim barbarians who worked havoc on the *Hindu* culture and way of life. Raja Rammohan Roy thanked the British upon whom he looked as God-sent deliverers.

When Deendayalji entered national, social and political fields of work, the British had left but the people had been gripped by the manners, dress and way of life and language of the British. The Muslims, drawing their inspiration from the poisonous feeling that they were the heirs of Aurangzeb, the *Hindu*-baiter and that they were once rulers here, raised their ugly head of anti-national separatism and continued striking at the cultural and political life of Hindus. The materialism of the West and the Dialectic Materialism of Karl Marx destroyed the intellectual independence of the English-educated young. Many outstanding persons in *Bharat* had no clear notion of what really was the content of independence. (At this stage it will be good to introduce the Sanskrit term *Rashtrakarya*. This cannot be adequately rendered by the term 'nationalism'.) Deendayalji included in his *Rashtrakarya* several things like *Swa-tantra* {*Swa*=our, *tantra*=technique or method); *Swa-rajya* (rajya-state); *Swa-bhasha* (*bhasha*-language); *Swavalamban* (self-reliance); *Swadeshi* (*Deshi*-indigenous); *Swatwa* (honour) etc. Just as he based his Integral Humanism on the four '*purusharthas*'' (objectives in life) and four aspects of human personality viz. body, mind, intellect and soul, alongwith various stages of self-expansion from man to family, society, humanity, universe etc., so also he enlarged upon the idea of '*Swa-tantra*' by including in it the several afore-mentioned *Swas*, which are its organic parts. That is why he never saw any parochialism in supporting and consolidating Hinduness and in his faith that the greatest good will come to this land out of Hinduness. He was never baffled by any problem. Ramabhakta Hanuman had a single criterion on which to check the usefulness of anything that faced him; the criterion was how the thing would promote his love of Rama. Like Hanuman Deendayalji would consider how the problem would affect *Rashtrakarya* and how a likely solution will at least not run counter to it. Take as an example his economics. He used to say that any budget that does not improve the lot of the underdog is strictly undesirable; but he knew also that in a mad race to help the poor, one cannot neglect defence requirements and an atomic bomb is a must irrespective of its high cost. For, he thought that our independence must be protected at all costs. He had no faith in a palace-revolution or a military coup but he believed only in people's revolution by democratic methods. Similarly, a budget must not be dominated by the Finance Ministry or share bazar brokers and bettors or selfish politicians but it (budget) must aim at improving a common man's lot; the budgetary provisions for achieving this must be explained to him and his co-operation must be sought. While talking to *Jana Sangh* workers who had been working among *Jhuggi-Jhopadi* dwellers at Chembur (Bombay) he said, "Inspire the Jhuggi dwellers to improve their lot. For this purpose collect a fund, a little at a time, so that out of it one day they can have better dwellings - may be after ten years. Do nothing merely to get their votes. Work steadily and remember, they are your brothers and sisters." Such was his ennobling view of life.

## Mind the Spirit Behind the Words

Deendayalji was a man of convictions; convictions about things that went with his '*Rashtrakarya*'- He never considered socialism as a philosophy of life, for socialism deals with a single aspect of life viz. economics. Because socialism indiscriminately opts for nationalisation which is a misnomer for governmentalisation, Deendayalji considered socialism more of a dogma than a rational theory. He could see clearly that where socialism has been put into practice, man has lost his freedom of expression. For 16 years Deendayalji was pointing out to the people the serious shortcomings of socialism, but the people had acquired such a craze for the word 'socialism' that anybody who talked against socialism was looked upon as people's enemy and a friend of capitalists. Deendayalji saw that his talk against socialism was creating a false image of himself and his party. But he was sagacious enough to perceive that what people did not like, was his condemnation of the word 'socialism' and not its evils. And he left off his opposition to the word 'socialism'. In his last speech at Bombay just a fortnight prior to his murder he said, "If socialism means employment and food to all, we are not opposed to it." And people were happy to hear this, because that was all socialism stood for as the common man could see. The common man was myopic and could not visualize the concentration of political and economic power in the state and the consequent state-tyranny and loss of the individual freedom. Deendayalji was not an enemy of word, so he did not quarrel with the word 'socialism'; he was opposed to its content other than employment and food etc. to all. Nehru disliked the word *Hindu* and Socialists disliked the word '*Dharma*'- Nehru and the Socialists would not care to look into the content of the words. Nehru could not see that Hindus (and Hindus alone) were the patriotic society here and Socialists would not use the word '*Dharmic*' (denoting non-corrupt) even in the days of rampant corruption. What is true of words is also unfortunately true of principles. Gandhi felt everything unimportant in comparison with '*Hindu*-Muslim unity'. And out of this fad of his, he always connived at the mass violence of Muslims against Hindus, ultimately resulting in the country's partition. See what Nehru has done. As an experiment in world peace, he compromised the sovereignty of *Bharat*; he considered his friendship with Sheikh Abdulla far more important than the integration of Kashmir with *Bharat*. To avoid war with China, he stretched his fad of negotiations to the bitter end. Gandhi and Nehru had values in life other than the country's independence and honour. So it was impossible to expect any thing better from other Congressmen. Not that these men were treachers comparable to Suryaji Pisai or Jayachand, but it can be emphatically said that they did not always hold the good of the country as their highest duty. Dr. Lohia was the leader of Congress Socialist Party. When the resolution for partition came before the All India Congress Committee, the Socialists remained neutral.

What exactly was the difference between Dr. Lohia and other Socialist leaders like Acharya Narendra Deo and Jaya Prakash Narayan? Dr. Lohia, after some time, felt ashamed of his neutrality and in self-condemnation he said, "I am very sorry that while our beloved motherland was being partitioned, not a man sacrificed his life or even went to jail to keep it intact. I also deeply regret, not having done anything. A fear psychosis was made to grip our mind, fear of terrible *Hindu*-Muslim riots and so at that historic moment, we had become effeminate. The worst thing was that our leadership had succumbed to a wrong notion..........Already the *Hindu*-Muslim question had passed any chances of solution. The big guns of Congress were hiding their power-lust behind tall talk but it was clearly discernible. Perhaps they were unconscious of this lust in their subconscious minds and might be feeling (and boasting) that they had been able to pick their way through the muddle." But Kakasaheb Gadgil, who remained a Congress leader to the end of his life, has been even more frank while exposing the Congress leaders' psyche at that time; he has said, "On the 3rd June was declared the partition of India and simultaneously rumors arose in Delhi as to the likely inclusions in the Central Ministry. Visitors to Gandhiji were being specially mentioned. This was the talk of the town, in all Congress circles and every one wanted to get a chance. The top bosses of Congress simply encamped in Delhi and with the zeal of pilgrims; they would repeatedly call upon Gandhi, Nehru, Patel and even Moulana Azad, that they may not be left out when fishes and loaves of power and positions would be doled out." Congressmen had, most of them, fought all their life for independence. But Gadgil's description shows how low they had fallen due to power-lust. Deendayalji, never, not even once in his life, gave in on the nation's sovereignty, unity and honour.

## No Dogmatism

With the British rule came law and order, security improved several fold and people became familiar with several new sciences which the West had developed during the earlier couple of centuries. But the Indian masses, once the initial euphoria was over, began to feel that they were being systematically exploited economically. The moment this realisation came, the leaders and thinkers came to the conclusion that the way to stop this economic drain was none other than to end the British Raj. After the elimination of the British and with the dawn of independence people had high hopes that unemployment and starvation will end and that all will be placed above want. In other terms, everybody expected to be economically independent and free to progress in his own way. But none of these things happened. One reason for this was that those persons who were supposed to help people, concentrated only on bettering their own lot. Workers of the ruling party, at all levels, began providing pastures for relatives-in-laws, friends and workers useful in election times. And to this end were abused all government institutions from Food Corporation to Finance Corporations and from Khadi-Gramodyog Commission to Oil and Natural Gas Commission. Not only this but some government institutions were created just so that some friends and relatives may be provided cushy and remunerative jobs. A second important reason for the failure was the faith of the rulers in certain notions which were irrational and whose experience ran counter to expectations. Thus for example, the social economists preached that in order to reduce food prices, it is necessary to 'nationalise' food trade and eliminate middle men (often ranging from 6 to 13 in numbers) between the farmer and the consumer. But saw what happened when the theory was put to practical test. The dozen or so private middle men were replaced by approximately an equal number of government officials. The officers were a far greater risk than the traders. The traders, at least took care to see that food stocks were not lost through rodents or spoiled by rain etc. But government officers were not at all that careful, nay they even connived at destructive causes. Food grains worth crores of rupees often rotted away in government stores. Crores worth of grains were stolen. This came as a shock to socio-economists and the way out they suggested was of co-operatives. But after all, who were the men who would operate the machinery of the co-operatives? Answer is the same selfish men (as elsewhere) who had no character. Wherein lay anything that would inspire character? None from Nehru to Nanasaheb Gore and no philosophy from secularism to socialism could answer this big question.

Obviously the Westernised leaders are incapable of answering this question for the simple reason that they utterly fail to see why it is necessary to couple economics with *Dharma* or Economics with morality or ethics and why it is necessary to base any system or 'ism' on the solid foundation of eternal *Dharma*, love of motherland

and the unity of people.

Deendayalji's economics was based not on the Western definition of 'man as an economic animal' but on his philosophy of Integral Humanism. The Western definition only takes into account the body-needs and the desire, for the happiness of the five sense organs. On the other hand Integral Humanism takes cognizance of the fact that man, in addition to his body, has mind, intellect and soul and he craves for happiness at all these four levels. If social planners concentrate on provision of body-needs and happiness only, man degenerates into a cesspool of selfishness. But *Dharma* teaches that a man has an inner urge to aspire for higher and higher level of happiness (in the order body, mind, intellect and soul) and in order to secure happiness at higher level one is willing, as a price, to welcome even unhappiness at a lower level. This urge can be utilised to ennoble a man until he comes to look upon the entire humanity as his brotherhood. Such were the thoughts, based on our culture and traditions that filled Deendayalji's heart and hence on occasions there easily escaped from his lips such highly significant sentences as: "A country's budget must not upset a common man's budget", "shortage of funds is bad, but so is money-worship or the abuse of wealth". But Deendayalji did not stop at laying forth the philosophy of Integral Humanism. He discussed in detail the outline of the country's economic plan, small schemes, securing people's co-operation, self-sufficiency in food, the risks in the food import under PL 480, how foreign loans unfavourably influence our foreign policy, the direction and speed of our industrialisation to make us self-reliant in our defence needs, etc. His planning was down to earth and matter of fact, taking into account the conditions actually obtaining here; hence he would call his economic policy as '*yatharthavadI* (a matter of fact-based). To explain this term further, he refused to tie down his country's economics to any bookish 'ism' or dogma which has not stood the test of time and experiment. He could clearly see the folly of conducting mechanised farming (based on imported machinery) here when crores of people are already unemployed and he also argued against the wisdom of constructing huge dams here. He thought that planning must be such that every tiller must be an owner of the land, farm implements must be made available to him through co-operatives and there must be guaranteed and reasonable prices for farm produce. There must be an increase in the farmer's purchasing power which would enable him to purchase consumer goods (either manufactured in city factories or in the villages by local craftsmen), there must be balanced development of farmer and factory worker and a balanced development of rural and urban areas. These thoughts were not based on any 'ism' or imported and ready-made pattern. Actually, chemical fertilizers were being imported while cows and bullocks were butchered and the far better organic manure in the form of cow-dung was being destroyed; instead of sinking oil wells here, diesel was being imported from Russia to power the tube well pumps in UP and the wheat thus grown was being exported back to Russia. Deendayalji considered such foreign dealings to be against our country's interests and so he put forward his independent economic principles which he felt would strengthen our independence and improve the people's lot. He was against both the state capitalism of Russia and the Laissez faire of America. In 1917, Russia went red and preached the ideals of International communism. During Stalin's time the communism was restricted to Russia but at the end of the Second World War there came into being a Russian communist empire in about ten states of Eastern Europe. Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, etc. were made servile to Russia in every way. Karl Marx's manifesto of international communism boasted of an ideal of freeing the entire humanity from capitalist exploitation. Modern Russia, born out of Karl Marx's philosophy, in less than a hundred years, established a highly exploitative communist empire. China, which proclaimed as per communistic theory that wars are the natural outcome of imperialism, itself shamelessly waged war against Tibet, *Bharat* and South-East Asia.

On this background, Deendayalji thought it his and his party's responsibility to free *Bharat* and the world from the turmoil of economic problems. He did not claim permanence for the applicability of his policies. But he did feel that his philosophy of Integral Humanism, based on the fourfold nature of man, was of eternal applicability. *Hindu* seers, since ancient times, had set before mankind four *Purusharthas* (i.e. objectives) and Deendayalji explained these in the context of modern times and showed their importance in the all-sided development of man. In economic planning for a country, any lop-sided development is risky. So it is also risky to develop out of proportions any of the four aspects of man viz. body, mind, intellect and soul. This all-aspect thinking is a special feature of Deendayalji's economics. Its aim was the good of the nation and its principles were eternal truths.

### Annul Partition: Liberate Pakistan

This country has been constantly aggressed against by foreigners during the past twelve centuries. This clearly means that *Bharat* proved to be weak compared to the aggressors. This was also so during the independence struggle.

When defence, both from external aggressors and from internal goondas (marauders), had broken down, Deendayalji put forward his ideas of defence. Savarkar was the first to declaim partition and strongly put forward the need of an army, one crore strong. Deendayalji, a thorough going RSS man, was busy organising *Jana Sangh* as the future ruling party. Hence he put forward an inspiring programme of defence study and plan, of arms and ammunition self-sufficiency, of training the masses to be defence minded, inspiring the people to achieve the four *purusharthas* and to rekindling their military prowess leading to a firm resolve to conquer back our lost territory (viz. so-called Pakistan). He declared categorically that the Muslims must be politically defeated and that Pakistan and China must be militarily defeated. No leader from any other political party so far had ever put forward such an integrated defence scheme. He supported defence preparedness and thus demanded repeal of the British Arms Act and also demanded nuclear arms. He also demanded that border security forces must be recruited from residents of border areas and that two years military training must be made compulsory for all college-going students. He had further pointed out the importance of taking into account our defence needs while planning industrial development.

But these are only the material things needed for defence. The defence of a country depends far more on the patriotic fervour for as Marathi Poet Kusumagraj says, "The warrior may be crippled but indomitable is the spirit in his heart." It was this unconquerable spirit that prompted Swatantryaveer Savarkar to do his dare-devil exploits. Deendayalji did all he could to inspire this spirit among the people and among his partymen. Hanuman, the new born baby, jumped high into the sky to grasp the effulgent ball of the sun. And similarly, the moment Deendayalji rose on the political horizon, he declared his determination to wipe off the partition blot and to reunite *Bharat*. Lifelong he worked towards this goal. A question often put to him was, "How do you propose to reunite *Bharat*? His reply used to be, "When Tilak declared that we will win our freedom, he had not referred to any particular way." Of course, he used to put forward cogent arguments in favour of *Akhand Bharat* or annulment of partition. In March 1964. *Jana Sangh* Central Working Committee resolved at Delhi, "The partition should be annulled and Pakistan must be liberated. That must be the nation's ultimate goal." The reasons for this are further clarified in a resolution of *Jana Sangh* representatives' meeting at Delhi, immediately following the massive Morcha in protest of Kachchha Pact. It says, "So long as Pakistan exists, *Bharat*-Pak peace attempts will be an exercise in futility. To yield to Pakistan's pressures only fuels its mounting arrogance. Pakistan's aspirations against *Bharat* are on the increase. A large group of Muslims in Hindusthan is emotionally one with Pakistan and these two strengthen each other. Two remedies are suggested: Pakistan's dreams of Moghal Empire must be smashed. And there should be no political bargaining whatsoever with Muslims in *Bharat*." The resolution further explains the fruits of this policy, "The people and rulers of Pakistan will then be compelled to introspect and they will perceive the folly of partition." Deendayalji had thus drawn an exhaustive programme of the country's defence. The first step, in this programme, was the huge Morcha (demonstration) to protest against the Kachchha-pact. Liberation of Bangla Desh was also a stage in the fight. At that time the atmosphere in Bangla Desh was surcharged with friendliness towards *Bharat*. In Music, Raveendra Sangeet was most popular. 'Vande Mataram' was being widely and spontaneously sung. But there was no seer like Deendayalji who could make use of all these favourable features and could integrate Bangla Desh with *Bharat*. In 1965 Deendayalji had demanded that our forces be permitted to pierce into Pakistan as far as Rawalpindi. Uri and Poonchh belong to us and the government was urged not to give these away to Pakistan. When we recall this demand of Deendayalji in 1965, we do feel that in 1971 he would have moved heaven and earth to get Bangla Desh united with *Bharat*. But the present book is limited to the life-time of Deendayalji and hence it is outside our scope to consider what he would have done on this or that occasion if he were living today. Hence there has been made here just a mention of what he may have done in 1971 as a logical consequence to his demand in 1965 regarding Pakistan. Lokmanya Tilak had not tied himself to any particular method for getting independence. Similarly, in his declaration, 'Annul partition and liberate Pakistan', Deendayalji had not bound himself down to any particular means. For him *Akhand Bharat* (undivided *Bharat*) was a matter of faith and so was above any compromise. Vis-a-vis defence preparedness, apart from physical things like industrial planning for defence needs, he placed before the people the ideals of *Akhand Bharat* which can inspire an unconquerable spirit and an inner urge to fight all aggression at all costs. This was divine remedy to prompt the young to work for the country's greatness, power and affluence. Shivaji inspired his men by telling that it was God's desire that there should be a *Hindu* kingdom and his men felt confident about their success. Subhash Chandra Bose thrilled his forces and prompted them to deeds of prowess by his words, "*Delhi Chalo* (Let us take Delhi in our stride). Savarkar had given an ideal to *Bharat*, "Liberate the Holy Sindhu River. No

*Hindu* finds life bearable without Sindhu." Similarly, Deendayalji had placed a great ideal before the people, "Annul partition and Liberate Pakistan." For this was intended our defence-preparedness and to this end must we plan our foreign politics. He was particular that in international affairs and events our country's interests must always be guarded. When a dispute arose about the control of the Suez Canal, it was in Bharat's interest that the canal be an international free trade artery. But Nehru attached undue importance to some extraneous consideration and helped a single nation to have control over the canal. The result was that the moment the canal was closed, our expense and delay in the Transport of goods to and from the West both went up. Deendayalji severely criticised this action of Nehru. From defence to foreign policy, Deendayalji had a single criterion on which to test their correctness; it was our country's interests.

### Party for What? Power for What?

Arya Chanakya did his politics only to instal an able and just king like Chandragupta and that done, he retired to forest for his penance. Chhatrapati Shivaji, the man of a naturally spiritual bend of mind, strove all his life to establish an independent *Hindu* kingdom as the only way to save Hindus from the Muslim onslaught, but during his conquest of the south, on reaching Mallikarjuna, was just prevented from offering his life to God Mallikarjuna. Lokmanya Tilak's first love was mathematics but realising the most urgent need of the times, he took to politics. Deendayalji nurtured by RSS Ideas and training, was primarily committed to the cultural unification of Hindus. But to save Hindus from the havoc Congressmen's selfish politics was doing to them, Deendayalji had to take to politics. When for six years he was cut off from politics, Lokmanya Tilak was inspired to meditate and write a gem of a book on Indian philosophy viz. '*Geeta-Rahasya*'. When forced by circumstances, Deendayalji had to personally contest an election, but in his election speech he was unable to say anything at all in self-praise; he was so unassuming, so simple. In all the cases mentioned here, none had any personal axe to grind. In Mahabharat is posed a question. "Does the king shape the times or is it the other way?" (कालो वा कारणं राज्ञः राजा वा कालाकारण्।) The poet's categorical answer is, "Do not be in doubt. It is the king that shapes the times," (''इति ते संशयो मा भूत राजा कालस्य कारणम्।।''). From Chanakya to Deendayalji, great politicians who had no selfish interest whatsoever were all quite familiar with the content of the above question and answer. History of last thousand years is witness to the fact that the rulers here, who were indeed foreign marauders, thoroughly destroyed the *Dharma*, culture and social life. If God's dictum (*Bhagavad Geeta*) "Protect the good men and destroy the evil doers" is to be followed then the Hindus must be rulers here. And so when Shivaji took up arms against the Muslim Rulers, he inspired his men by saying, "It is God's desire that Hindus should have a sovereign kingdom." Deendayalji never lost sight of what *Jana Sangh* wanted power for, whether it was *Grampanchayat* election or the formation of coalition ministries. He had no high hopes about these ministries, nor did he ever feel elated by whatever success they had. While planning for electoral success, while conducting the propaganda, or after being successful, while forming the ministries, he never permitted his party workers to lose their mental composure. Coalition ministries were but a first step in removing the misrule of Congress. And if this failed on any account, there was no reason to lose heart and workers must continue to consolidate party work so that there will be better luck next time. Getting into ministerial positions was not an end in itself but only a means to an end. His presidential speech at Calicut speaks volumes of his political sagacity and telescopic vision. He said, "Three kinds of problems have arisen after the elections. The first kind is connected with the transitional politics. It comprises of the fractionations of various parties, the instability of the ministries and defections. The second kind refers to the inter-province and Centre-province relations. The third kind is about the nation's economics, internal security and foreign policy. The first group contains current topics and though being much discussed, is not really very important. It is the second and the third groups that may seriously and adversely affect the country's interests and even unity if not carefully attended to before it is too late." These words of his bring out how in his eyes certain things were of secondary importance - things like formation of electoral fronts and the continuation or breaking up of coalition ministries. To him a much more important thing was the purpose to which power was to be put. Newspaper editorials, press conferences of politicians, workers' meetings and party sessions devote maximum time and energy to discussion on election fronts and the likely future candidates for chief ministerships and premiership. Very few indeed devote adequate thought to the second and third group of national problems about which Deendayalji speaks.

Herewith is given a very significant quotation from his presidential speech at Calicut. "A new era is in the offing since September 1965 when the *Bharatiya jawans* were victorious against Pakistan. But the Congress government policy, as evidenced by Tashkent pact, showed that Congress is incapable of inaugurating or consolidating the new era. And the people desired to be free from the Congress rule with its defeatist mentality. This desire was expressed by the people by defeating Congress in several provinces. (The idea of an *ekatma* constitution was so deeply rooted in his mind, that he often used the term 'province' in place of the term 'State'). The effect would have been more striking if opposition parties were stronger. But of all opposition parties the success of *Jana Sangh* is outstanding, though it is inadequate to meet the need of the hour. It is however obvious that *Jana Sangh* has the capacity to be an alternative to the Congress. This is clear from the vast support *Jana Sangh* is getting since elections and from the rapid growth of *Jana Sangh*'s organisation."

The political change which Deendayalji wanted to bring about was through the medium of *Jana Sangh* and its ideology and policies. And so while wading through the troubles and tribulations of day-to-day inter-party affairs, he never even once thought of merging his party with any other party or parties. Thus when there was talk about the merger of *Jana Sangh* and Swatantra Party, he turned down the proposal with hard logic. The various political parties (apart from

*Jana Sangh*) were either born out of Congress culture or out of thought-disciplines not grounded in our culture. Deendayalji wanted to retain the independence and identity of *Jana Sangh* so that its capacity for national reconstruction will not be hampered in any way. *Jana Sangh* wanted power not as an end in itself but as a means to national reconstruction.

## The Change of Era Suddenly Halted

The change of era he worked for was but a part of the national consciousness he was trying to rekindle. Deendayalji had often said that political parties divide rather than unite. The remedy lies in regarding politics as a part of *Rashtrakarya* (Anything and everything done in the all-round interest of the nation), by contesting elections with mutual understanding and without mud-slinging and not by looking upon democracy as a convenient way of getting into power but as a way of healthy national life. Deendayalji closely followed this precept and disciplined his party workers to do the same. He was a thinker par excellence and all his thoughts were directed towards the all-round national progress. He was deeply imbibed with pure and deep love of motherland and till the end RSS remained his mentor and mainstay. At the time of the formation of first coalition ministries in Punjab and Haryana, he had to face a tussle between the *Jana Sanghis* who had a faith in RSS and new-comers to Jana Sangh Maulichandra Sharma, who succeeded Dr. Mookherji as president of *Jana Sangh*.., had tried to factionate *Jana Sangh* and to pressurise Deendayalji. But Deendayalji stood fast like a rock on the principle of *Hindu Rashtra*. In an article published in April 1963 (on the occasion of the consecration of a memorial to Poojaneeya Dr. Hedgewar at Nagpur) he has said, "Politics divides rather than unites. Hence it is necessary to strengthen the unifying factors. The divisive factors which come to surface must not be exploited to further divide people. Political fields in which institutional egos are dominant, will fail to strengthen national unity. A separate arrangement is needed for this.

"For forging national unity it is necessary to strengthen those factors that have held us together as one people from times immemorial. We must restrict individual interests so as not to jeopardise social interests. These objectives can never be achieved by either secularism or by socialism; none of these can kindle the internal driving force of the *Hindu* way of life. There is only one source of this and it is *Hindu*ness. Hinduness is the one bond that unites the *Hindu* crores."

In politics, Gandhi and Nehru over-emphasized the importance of *Hindu*-Muslim unity in independence efforts and this paved the path of partition. Dr. Ambedkar recognised the refractory Muslim separatism and suggested the giving away of Pakistan. Savarkar would welcome unconditional Muslim co-operation but was all the while ready and confident to go it alone. Deendayalji would not consider Muslims as a separate people and appealed to them to remain faithful to *Bharatiya* culture. The remedy he suggested for integration of Muslims consisted in 'Political Defeat of Muslims' and 'Annulment of Partition and Liberation of Pakistan'. His politics was *Rashtrakarya*, all-embracing, all-pervasive, all-accommodative, unyielding and very effective. This politics was potent to solve Muslim and other problems. Whether it was economics, planning or defence, whether it was coalition ministries or foreign affairs, his analysis and remedies suggested were original and fundamental. He was aware of the all-pervasive nature of state power and it was out of this awareness that he did his politics to secure power. But while doing this, he never lost his mental poise and never developed an attachment to power for its own sake. He knew that power does not come as a matter of natural course, but by a historical course. A fruit detached from a tree remains neither in mid air nor goes up but naturally falls down under gravity. Water evaporates, forms clouds and again comes down as rain. This is a natural course. Power is never got by any such natural process. Shift of centre of power comes through a historical course and the course is set going by some individual. The Moghal kingdom had become weak due to internal conflicts, but it did not on that account naturally destroy itself. For this a Shivaji, with great prowess and vision, had to be born. The British power in India, though rendered weak by the Second World War, would not have automatically collapsed. It was ended by the hundred year independence struggle. The Congress rule, by its selfish and anti-national policies and activities had brought the country to the verge of ruin. To free the country from the Congress stranglehold, Deendayalji had put forward a new and all-embracing philosophy, based on deep thinking, extensive experience of life, intense interest in social welfare and a selfless and undaunted spirit. An inevitable step for this to be achieved was getting political power; but it was just a step and not the final goal. That is why in his Calicut speech he had referred to 'getting into power' as the least important of the three sets of national problems. His soul was too strong to get entangled in power lust and so poised and balanced as not to be misled and carried away by being power-drunk. His political foresight guessed aright that *Jana Sangh* would soon be coming to power and he was preparing workers for its proper use. He was aware that there is often a slip between the cup and the lip. He had framed rules of how far to go at the most to retain power-a thus far and no more limit. Thus his politics was solely for national upliftment only. And hence, he never sacrificed his *Rashtrakarya* for any political expediency. Just when his *Rashtrakarya* was about to fructify, destiny suddenly withdrew him from amongst us.

* * *

**About the Author**

# Shri Balwant Narayan Jog

In this book it is Shri B.N. Jog who has brought out an exposition of the political thinking of Pandit Deendayalji. He was for some time an editor of weekly '*Vivek*'. He has made an in-depth study of the Muslim problem and has published a book 'Bhạratacha Yakshaprashna' on this subject. He has been a prolific writer on various political topics in different periodicals. He is the author of the book 'Maoche Ahvan'. Clarity is a special quality of his writings. He has received university education up to MA. At present he is the manager of Travel Company '*Bharat Darshan*'. And as such he has widely travelled in our country. He stays in Mulund (East), Bombay.

## हमारे मुख्य प्रकाशन

| पुस्तक नाम | लेखक | मूल्य (रु.) |
|---|---|---|
| श्रीगुरुजी – 'एक बहुआयामी व्यक्तित्व' | डॉ. जागेश्वर पटले | 180 |
| वयम् हिन्दवः | ओमप्रकाश पहूजा | 110 |
| राष्ट्रीय नवोत्थान – स्वामी विवेकानन्द का दिव्य-दर्शन और रा. स्व. संघ की लक्ष्य साधना | के. सूर्य नारायण राव | 120 |
| प्रखर राष्ट्रभक्त –डॉ. भीमराव अम्बेडकर | सी.एस. भण्डारी, एस.आर. रामस्वामी | 70 |
| ...और देश बँट गया | हो. वे. शेषाद्रि | 160 |
| न फूल चढ़े न दीप जले | नीलकंठ देशमुख | 90 |
| प्राचीन भारत अध्यात्म और विज्ञान | डॉ. ओम प्रभात अग्रवाल | 50 |
| भारतीय शिक्षा के मूल तत्व | लज्जाराम तोमर | 90 |
| हिंदू विजय युग प्रवर्तक | हो. वे. शेषाद्रि | 140 |
| मृत्युंजय भारत | उमाकान्त केशव आपटे | 140 |
| ज्योति जला निज प्राण की | म. च. वाजपेयी, श्रीधर पराडकर | 200 |
| श्री गुरुजी-व्यक्तित्व और कृतित्व | डॉ. कृष्ण कुमार बवेजा | 90 |
| पॉलिटिकल डायरी | दीनदयाल उपाध्याय | 100 |
| एकात्म मानव दर्शन | मा.स. गोलवलकर, दत्तोपन्त ठेंगड़ी दीनदयाल उपाध्याय | 70 |
| भारत परिचय प्रश्न मंच | डॉ. हरिश्चन्द्र वर्थ्वाल | 80 |
| परिवार प्रबोधन | संकलित | 20 |
| हिन्दू प्रतिभा के दर्शन | रवि कुमार | 150 |
| पुण्यभूमि भारत | जुगल किशोर शर्मा | 60 |
| केशव – संघ निर्माता | सी. पी. भिशिकर | 90 |
| भारतीय संस्कृति का विश्व संचार | डॉ. शरद हेबालकर | 75 |
| सच्चा सुख निरोगी काया | रामनारायण पुरी | 35 |
| कृतिरूप संघ दर्शन | हो. वे. शेषाद्रि | 200 |
| क्या कहते हैं संघ पर न्यायालय? | अनुवादक – विनोद बजाज | 75 |
| शाखा सुरभि | संकलित | 40 |
| भारत एकात्मतास्तोत्र व्याख्या (सचित्र) | डॉ. हरिश्चन्द्र बर्थ्वाल | 90 |
| अमर हिन्दू राष्ट्र | उमाकान्त केशव आपटे | 35 |
| संघ चिन्तन | उमाकान्त केशव आपटे | 30 |
| संजीवनी विद्या | उमाकान्त केशव आपटे | 30 |
| व्यक्ति एवं समाज-चिंतन | उमाकान्त केशव आपटे | 40 |
| माँ के चरणों में | रंगा हरि | 20 |

| पुस्तक नाम | लेखक | मूल्य (रु.) |
|---|---|---|
| नमस्ते सदा वत्सले..... | श्री गुरुजी, बाबा साहब आपटे<br>दीनदयाल उपाध्याय | 35 |
| श्री गुरुजी – हिन्दू राष्ट्र की अवधारणा | डॉ. जागेश्वर पटले | 35 |
| श्री गुरुजी – एक राष्ट्रवादी संगठक | डॉ. जागेश्वर पटले | 35 |
| श्री गुरुजी – परिचय एवं व्यक्तित्व | डॉ. जागेश्वर पटले | 35 |
| मैं साधारण स्वयंसेवक | मा. स. गोलवलकर | 15 |
| राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा | मोहनराव भागवत (गोष्ठी) | 17 |
| राष्ट्र निर्माण में युवाओं का योगदान | मोहनराव भागवत (गोष्ठी) | 25 |
| संघ उत्सव | संकलित | 25 |
| जो शहीद हुए हैं उनकी ज़रा याद करो कुर्बानी | संकलन – विजय कुमार गुप्ता | 15 |
| भारत एकात्मतास्तोत्र व्याख्या | डॉ. हरिश्चन्द्र बर्थ्वाल | 10 |
| विवेक जीवन | डॉ. सुशील गुप्ता | 35 |
| सेवा-व्रत एवं संघ-साधना | एकनाथ रानडे | 70 |
| प्राचीन भारतीय शिक्षा पद्धति | लज्जाराम तोमर | 75 |
| भारत इस्लामी राज्य की ओर –एक चेतावनी! | डॉ. के वी. पालीवाल | 20 |
| हिन्दू जागरण क्यों और कैसे? | डॉ. के वी. पालीवाल | 75 |
| भारतीय मुसलमानों के हिन्दू पूर्वज मुसलमान कैसे बने | पुरूषोत्तम | 40 |
| मैक्समूलर द्वारा वेदों का विकृतीकरण –क्या, क्यों और कैसे | डॉ. के वी. पालीवाल | 70 |
| भारतीय महापुरुषों की दृष्टि में इस्लाम | डॉ. के वी. पालीवाल | 45 |
| जिहाद क्या और क्यों? | डॉ. के वी. पालीवाल | 55 |
| वेदों में राष्ट्र भक्ति | डॉ. के वी. पालीवाल | 40 |
| सूफ़ियों द्वारा भारत का इस्लामीकरण | पुरूषोत्तम | 25 |
| ईसाईयत की असलियत | डॉ. के वी. पालीवाल | 35 |
| प्रेरक बाल कथाएँ | श्री निवास वत्स | 40 |
| लघु बाल कथाएँ | श्री निवास वत्स | 15 |
| अनमोल कहानियाँ | वचनेश त्रिपाठी | 30 |
| पंचतंत्र की कथाएँ | डॉ. के. एस. रंगप्पा | 35 |
| मीठे बोल कथा अन्मोल | वचनेश त्रिपाठी | 35 |
| सर्वोच्च न्यायालय का ऐतिहासिक निर्णय – हिन्दुत्व एक जीवन-पद्धति | संकलित | 35 |

| पुस्तक नाम | लेखक | | मूल्य (रु.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| वीर माताएँ | संगीता पवार | | 50 |
| भारत वन्दना | संकलित | | 35 |
| मातृ वन्दना | संकलित | | 35 |
| हिन्दु नवोत्थान | मोहनराव भागवत (बौद्धिक) | | 20 |
| मुस्लिम शासक तथा भारतीय जन-समाज | डॉ. सतीश चन्द्र मित्तल | | 70 |
| योग एक सामाजिक अनिवार्यता | हो. वे. शेषाद्रि | | 20 |
| हिन्दू राष्ट्र क्यों ? | हो. वे. शेषाद्रि, सूर्य नारायण राव<br>कु. सी. सुदर्शन, प्रो. बलराज मधोक<br>प्रो. ओम प्रकाश कोहली | | 40 |
| नरेन्द्र मोदी के सपनों का भारत<br>(His Insightful Speeches) | - | | 50 |
| श्री गुरुजी - दृष्टि और दर्शन | संकलित | | 140 |
| संघ का आह्वान - जगे राष्ट्र पुरुषार्थ | मोहनराव भागवत (बौद्धिक) | | 22 |
| देश की ज्वलंत समस्याएँ एवं समाधान | श्रीगुरुजी (प्रैसवार्ता) | | 40 |
| आओ जानें भारत | जगदीश तोमर | | 40 |
| माँ! अब तो खोलो द्वार | गो. नी. दाण्डेकर | | 120 |
| श्री अरविन्द का राष्ट्र को आह्वान | देवदत्त | | 50 |
| भारत का संक्षिप्त इतिहास | डॉ. सतीश अग्रवाल | | 35 |
| महर्षि वाल्मीकीकृत श्री रामसंवाद<br>(Shri Ram's Discourses) | | | 110 |
| Hindu Resurgence in Indonesia | V. Ravi Kumar | | 140 |
| Jammu & Kashmir<br>A State in Turbulence - | Narender Sehgal | (PB) | 120 |
| | | (HB) | 200 |
| RSS At a Glance | Dr. Suresh Chandra Bajpai | | 20 |
| Supreme Court Judgement<br>on 'Hindutva A Way of Life' | M. Rama Jois | | 35 |
| Scientific Outlook of Hindu Dharma | K. S. Sudarshan | | 20 |
| Political Diary | Pt. Deendayal Upadhyaya | | 120 |
| Punya-Bhoomi Bharat | Compiled | | 70 |
| Why Hindu Rashtra ? | H.V. Seshadri, K.S. Sudarshan<br>K. S. Narayan Rao,<br>Prof. B. Madhok | | 30 |
| Yoga - A Social Imperative | H.V. Seshadri | | 10 |
| The Role of Youth in Nation Building | Mohan Rao Bhagwat (Meet) | | 25 |
| विदेशी रानी | आचार्य रामरंग | (PB) | 250 |
| | | (HB) | 350 |

| पुस्तक नाम | लेखक | मूल्य (रु.) |
|---|---|---|
| कम्युनिस्ट आतंकवाद | तरुण विजय | 100 |
| पर्यावरण प्रेमी हिन्दू दृष्टि | डॉ. बजरंग लाल गुप्त | 25 |
| संगठित हिन्दू-समर्थ भारत | मोहनराव भागवत (बौद्धिक) | 25 |
| हिन्दू मानसिकता | दत्तोपन्त ठेंगड़ी | 25 |
| समन्वय संकल्पना | मोहनराव भागवत (बौद्धिक) | 22 |
| डॉ. अम्बेडकर की दृष्टि में मुस्लिम कट्टरवाद | एस. के. अग्रवाल | 25 |
| श्री गुरुजी - एक अनोखा नेतृत्व | मा. गो. वैद्य | 40 |
| रा. स्व. संघ प्रस्ताव | संकलित | 100 |
| वैदिक राष्ट्र-दर्शन - 1 | बाल शास्त्री हरदास | 35 |
| वैदिक राष्ट्र-दर्शन - 2 | बाल शास्त्री हरदास | 35 |
| वैदिक राष्ट्र-दर्शन - 3 | बाल शास्त्री हरदास | 35 |
| हाँ! हम हिन्दू हैं | लक्ष्मण टोपले | 40 |
| ध्येय-दृष्टि | मा. स. गोलवलकर | 20 |
| दरिया भवानी | जी. एस. दाण्डेकर | 110 |
| दास बोध | विजय कुमार | 25 |
| The People versus Emergency: A Saga of Struggle | P.G. Sahastrabuddhe<br>Manik Chandra Bajpai | 110 |
| Partition-Days The Fiery Saga of RSS | Manik Chandra Bajpai<br>Shridhar Paradkar | 150 |
| स्वराज्य-संस्थापक शिवाजी-1 | दि.वि. पातुरकर | 30 |
| स्वराज्य-संस्थापक शिवाजी-2 | आनन्द आदीश | 30 |
| नान्यः पन्था | हो. वे. शेषाद्रि | 25 |
| गोरक्षा - राष्ट्र रक्षा गोसेवा - जनसेवा | गौरीशंकर भारद्वाज | 45 |
| जीवन मूल्य (तीन भाग) | प्र. ग. सहस्रबुद्धे (प्रत्येक भाग) | 60 |
| प्रेरणा दीप-1 वीरव्रत परम् सामर्थ्य सच्चे वीरों के सच्चे कारनामें | दीनानाथ बत्रा | 50 |
| प्रेरणा दीप-2 आत्मवत् सर्वभूतेषु | दीनानाथ बत्रा | 80 |
| प्रेरणा दीप-3 माँ का आह्वान भारत माँ के सपूत | दीनानाथ बत्रा | 50 |
| प्रेरणा दीप-4 पूजा हो तो ऐसी | दीनानाथ बत्रा | 15 |

954.04092,JOG-P
165785

GURUKUL KANGRI LIBRARY

| | Signature | Date |
|---|---|---|
| Access No. | | |
| Class No | | |
| Cat No. | | |
| Tag etc. | | 10/4/19 |
| E.A.R. | | |
| Recomm. by. | Prof Satyadev | |
| Data Ent. by | | |
| Checked | | |

# Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya

## IDEOLOGY AND PERCEPTION

Much has been written about the life and work of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, who was a living example of simple living and high thinking .

But the scope and depth covered by Shri Thengadi, Shri Nene, Shri Bhishikar, Shri Kelkar, Shri Kulkarni, Shri Jog and Shri Deodhar to present effectively the manifold aspects of Shri Upadhyaya's basic thought– both, political and philosophical, is really very commendable.

The seven volumes on 'Ideology and Perception' of Shri Upadhyaya should be made a subject of reading, thinking and contemplation by every sociopolitical worker.

Atal Bihari Vajpayee

**AN INQUEST**
(Independent enunciation in the form of introduction to the rest six parts)
By D.B. Thengadi

**INTEGRAL HUMANISM**
By V.V. Nene

**POLITICAL THOUGHT**
By B.K. Kelkar

**INTEGRAL ECONOMIC POLICY**
By Sharad Anant Kulkarni

**CONCEPT OF THE RASHTRA**
By C.P. Bhishikar

**POLITICS FOR NATION'S SAKE**
By B.N. Jog

**A PROFILE**
By V.N. Deodhar

95
Jo

सुरुचि प्रकाशन
केशव कुंज, झण्डेवाला, नई दिल्ली-110055
फोन : 011-23514672, 23634561
ईमेल : suruchiprakashan@gmail.com
वेब साईट : www.suruchiprakashan.com

मूल्य : ₹ 80

ISBN : 978-93-81500-81-1